This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Digitized by Google

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.
GIFT OF
Horace L Wheeler
Class 31
A271

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

ONE SHILLING

CHARACTERISTICS

OF

THE ROMISH CHURCH

BY

B. WILLARD-ARCHER

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LONDON

SWAN SONNENSCHEIN & Co., Lim

Paternoster Square

[*All Rights Reserved*]

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

CHARACTERISTICS

OF

THE ROMISH CHURCH

BY

B. WILLARD-ARCHER

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

London
SWAN SONNENSCHEIN & CO., LIM.
PATERNOSTER SQUARE
1904
[*All Rights Reserved*]

Digitized by Google

Horace L. Wheeler 1904
Boston

BX1755
W57

Digitized by Google

v. Lord Acton's Letters to Mary Gladstone
Macmillan 1904

PREFACE

Few persons are so rash as to entrust their money to any association, without previous inquiry into its honesty and character; yet, in matters more important than earthly possessions, the same caution is so little used, that of those induced to desire reunion with the Romish Church, a very large proportion takes little or no pains to learn the qualities of that institution. Such supineness is chiefly due to the trouble involved by a thorough search into records, extending over nearly twenty centuries and by carefully testing the veracity of statements. This volume is intended to lighten such labour; it is not a history of the papacy, nor of popes, but an investigation into the origin and evolution of certain characteristics of the Romish Church. Repetition of facts has been, it is hoped, avoided; some overlapping in chronology is, however, inevitable.

B. WILLARD-ARCHER.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

THE ROMISH CHURCH IS NOT PETRINE 1

St. Paul against Hebraic rites (1). The princedom of Peter unscriptural (3). Binding and loosing given to all Apostles (4). Sphere of Peter's labours (5). Myth of his presence in Rome (8). Scriptural evidence of his itinerary (9). Myth of his bishopric in Rome (10). The Paulo-Simon Myth (12). Quo vadis and anothen (15). Nero, Paul and Peter (15). Uncertainty of his burial-place (16). Rota of first twelve Romish bishops (20).

CHAPTER II

DISSENSION 22

Divergencies among Apostles and early disputes (22). The Donatist and the Arian dispute (23). Constantine and the Council of Nicæa (25). The term "Catholic" (26). Reopening of the Arian question (27). Cyril and Theotokos (30). Introduction of Eidola (31). Rome tampers with Nicæne formula (32). Split between Greek and Romish Churches (33).

CHAPTER III

PAPAL MANNERS 34

Early corruption of Romish clerics (35). Clerical gift and legacy hunting (36). Theory of papal elections (37). Their practice (38). Popes kept in order by laity (46). Debau-

Digitized by Google

chery of Monks (47). A prelate on papal abominations (48). Clerical impudicitia and Liber Gomorrhianus (49). Boniface VIII. the proud sinner (51). Priests in the 14th century (51). Monks (54). Nuns (54).

CHAPTER IV

WEALTH 56

Splendour of Churches after Nicæa (57). Spoliation by spiritual terror (58). Venality of Curia and extortion (62). As attested by eight cardinals (63). What Rome got from England and France (64). Episcopal riches in Austro-Hungary (65). Indulgencies and the "taxæ cancellariæ" (66). Reprobated by Romish prelates (67). The meaning of indulgence (68). Items of payment for sins (68). The Bull of Composition (69). Permission of future sins (71).

CHAPTER V

AGGRESSION 72

Equality in primitive Church (72). The Ignatian forgeries (73). Obedience due to monarchs (74). Each bishop to rule only his own see (74). Assuming title of Universal Bishop condemned by Gregory I. (75). Purchased by connivance in murder (76). The Isidor forgeries (77). Election of popes invalid unless with Imperial assent (79). Gregory VII. dictatus (80). A council condemns and deposes him (82). Perjury of Paschal II. (83). Countess Matilda's alleged will (83). Boast of Innocent III. (83). His tyranny and bloodthirst (85). Impudence of Paul IV. to Elizabeth of England (86). Misusing the "power of the Keys" (87).

CHAPTER VI

SCHISM 88

Papal residence at Avignon (88). Contemporary writers' description of Avignon (89). Philip-le-Bel's coercion of papacy (89). Clement VI. claims possession of Germany,

Digitized by Google

and orders Greek Church to submit (90). The butchery of Cæsena (91). A conclave in Rome and beginning of Greet Schism (92). Murder of Cardinals by Urban VI. (93). Council of Pisa three simultaneous popes (95). A pirate-pope (95). Council of Constance decrees popes must obey councils (96). John XXIII. deposed. Gregory abdicates (97). Council of Basel confirms the Constance decrees (98). Attempt to reunite Greek and Romish Churches (100). Æneas Sylvius (Pius II.) (103).

CHAPTER VII

THE ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION 105

Immorality in the Vatican (105). Luxury and nepotism (107). Sixtus IV. fails to murder Lorenzo the Magnificent (108). Innocent VIII. becomes the Sultan's head-jailor (109). The Holy Spear, Witchcraft (10). Roderigo Borja buys the papacy (111). He becomes the Sultan's secret poisoner (112). The soldier pope (114). The treacheries of Clement VIII. (117). Rome relapses to heathenry (116). English Christianity not derived from Rome (118). Cynicism of Romish prelates (120). The council to amend the Church (121). Romish tricks at the Tridentine (123). Papal Massacres (124).

CHAPTER VIII

PAGANISM REVIVED 125

Sancti or Divi (126). Roman and Romish idolatry (128). The iconoclastic strife (129). Pope decrees idolatry (130). Indecent images in churches (132). Relics (133). Myth of invention of Cross and of Holy Coat (134). Pius IX. and a letter from Christ (135). Sacerdotal jugglery (138). Votive Offerings (139). Pagan and Romish priests (141). Religious Orders (142). Immorality of Nuns (144). Toilet, tonsure, pastoral staff (145). Priestly celibacy (146). Processions (147). Flagellation (150). Lustral and holy-water (151). Incense (152). Kissing the Foot (154).

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER IX

MASS—TRANSUBSTANTIATION 156

Rites of heathen Rome (156). The great Pontiff (158). Days especially holy (159). Rites of modern Rome (160). Romish libation. Eastward position (161). Items of Mass (162). Jubilee (164). Late introduction of transubstantiation (165). Repentance and penance (166). Dicta of six popes reversed at Constance and Trent (169). Stultiloquy at Trent (171).

CHAPTER X

MARIOLATRY. 173

Rhea or Bona Dea, Queen of Heaven (173). Her place taken now by Mary (174). Myth of Mary's death (175). She controls the Almighty. All benefits to Man come from her (177). Mariolatry is worship of female beauty (178). She of Salette and Lourdes (176). Mary as Warrior (180). Multitudinous rival Marys (181).

CHAPTER XI

WITHHOLDING SCRIPTURE 182

Study of Bible detrimental to papistry (183). Massacre of its readers (184). Tridentines abuse the Scriptures (185). To burn the Scripture is an "Act of Faith" (186). Prelates say that Holy Writ is poison (187),

CHAPTER XII

FORGIVE US OUR SINS 188

Confession at first public (189). Early abuse of (190), Confessor priest superior to God (191). Priests make confessing a snare for women (194). Largely used for carnality (195). Futile attempts to correct this (196). Perjured clergy intrude it into English Church. The road that leads to Hell (197). It is mistrust of the Saviour (198).

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XIII

THE INQUISITION 199

Transsubstantiation intruded (199). Massacres of Albigenses and Waldenses (201). Evolution of Inquisition (203). Its methods (204). Fate of victims (206). Prolonging their suffering (208). Number of victims (209). Witchcraft (210). Abusing female captives (212). Popes and curia long to restore it (214).

CHAPTER XIV

JESUITS 216

Institution of Jesuits (216). Their aggressiveness denounced (218). Jesuit missions (219). Their trading (221). A huge swindle (222). Their love of power (222). Casuistry (223). King and Pope murders (231). Their abolition (234). Clement XIV. poisoned (235). Jesuits in Church of England (236).

CHAPTER XV

INFALLIBILITY 238

Romish hatred of the Bible (239). State of Rome under Gregory XVI. (240). Pius IX. as a liberal (241). The immaculate decree (242). Papal aggression on England (244). Packing a council (246). Objectors howled down (248). Infallibility and cessation of temporal power (250).

CHAPTER XVI

THE PEACE POPE 252

The Syllabus (252). Leo XIII., the bellicose Peace Pope (254). His mendacious circulars (257). Romish treatment of slaves (258). A pope's slave-bargains (261). Popes condemn many nations to slavery (262). Leo XIII. and labour (264). His ferocious intolerance (267).

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XVII

PAPO-CÆSARISM 269

Pope's claim to be God and Emperor (269). Parliament duped (279). Validity of English Orders (271). Popes have no valid status (271). Popish claims anti-christian (273). They, founded on fraud, are upheld by massacre (274).

Digitized by Google

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER I

THE ROMISH CHURCH IS NOT PETRINE

For He who wrought effectually in Peter to the Apostleship of the circumcision.

NEARLY two thousand years ago when a divine child was born at Bethlehem, shepherds in the fields saw a company of angels floating in supernatural light and heard them sing: "Peace on earth and good will to man." Some thirty years afterwards, He, the subject of this hymn, said to His disciples: "I come not to bring peace, but a sword." A few years after His Ascension this latter prophecy began to be fulfilled even among His apostles and disciples. These had formed a community at and around Jerusalem, which, at first solitary, became for a time supreme in matters of faith and practice; the members of this community were Jews, accepting the teaching of the Master yet holding to the Mosaic law, which they asserted had not been abrogated. But four years later, one Paul, belonging to the strictest sect or "hairesis" of the Pharisees, being miraculously converted to the new faith, became soon afterwards aware that the regulations which kept the Jews apart from the rest of the world deterred that rest from conversion to Christianity; he therefore preached and taught that most of the Hebraic rites, and especially that of circumcision, was an unnecessary preliminary to acceptation of the Gospel. This divergence was very

Digitized by Google

important. Religions of the world were at that time divided into two chief categories, polytheism and monotheism. The more enlightened of the former section, feeling that much of the popular credence was absurd and revolting, were already gravitating towards belief in One God. On the other side, of which Judaism was the centre, many, aided by the study of philosophy and by mixing in business with other races, gradually relaxed the rigidity of the thora and became "Hellenized." These, as well as new converts from the Gentile world, "proselytes of the gate," were regarded with suspicion and dislike by the rigid ones; to mingle or to eat with them was defilement. In becoming Christians the Hebrews still adhered to the Mosaic law, asserting that Gentiles joining the community of the faithful must conform to that legislation; that is to say, any one outside that narrow circle wishing to embrace Christianity must previously or simultaneously become a Jew. It was against this system that Paul protested; the contention occupies a large part of Acts and much of the Apostle's epistles; the sides are called respectively the doctrine of the circumcision and of the uncircumcision, and in those scriptures it is again and again asserted that Peter was commissioned to the former, Paul to the latter (Acts XI. 2; Gal. II. 7, 8, 9): in other words, the task of Paul was to convert the Gentiles (heathens); that of Peter the Jews.

Nevertheless, the Romish Church formulates certain assertions. Among them three only need here be specified. 1—That Peter was the prince of the apostles. 2—That to him alone was granted the power to bind and to loose. 3—That he founded the Church of Rome and was for twenty-five years its bishop.

1.—The princedom of Peter over the other apostles is quite unscriptural. The Gospels more than once record that Christ strongly objected to any desire

Digitized by Google

among the twelve for supremacy, and that He rebuked their contentions on this point. After the Resurrection, Peter himself was unaware of any pre-eminence, else he would not have submitted to the reproof of the others at Jerusalem (Acts XI. 2), nor afterwards to the blame of Paul (Gal. II. 11). The others had no idea that he held a superior position, or they had not ventured to rebuke him; and it was not he, but "James brother of the Lord" who governed the Church (Euseb. Hist. Eccles. Lib. II. c. 23). In Jerusalem, at the council held to determine whether Gentiles might be admitted to Christianity without submitting to the Hebrew tribal rite, it was James who presided and gave judgment, accentuating that it was his own by using, what is unnecessary either for construction or comprehension, the word Ego. Paul certainly, when years afterwards writing one of his letters, would not have said, had he been his prince, that Peter was worthy of blame. Thus the words and actions of the apostles show clearly that Peter did not consider himself as their prince, neither did the others regard him in that light; any position of superiority they may have entertained was conceded to James.

2.—The claim which the Romish Church sets up for Peter is intimately connected with the assertion that to him alone was given the power to remit or retain sins, to close or open the gates of Heaven. In the verse relied on (Matt. XVI. 19), the second person singular being used, the gift is on that particular occasion imparted to Peter alone; but in that very Gospel (XVIII. 18) the same words, save that the metaphor of keys is omitted, are used. Again, St. John's Gospel describing the gathering of not apostles only, but also of disciples, relates that the risen Lord confided to those present, the same power of retaining or remitting sins; which of course means reception to or exclusion from Heaven. These apostles

Digitized by Google

and disciples founded churches in many parts of the world, which, if this gift be transmissible, inherited equally with the Romish Church that power.

3.—To show that Peter did not found, in fact that he had nothing to do with instituting the Church of Rome will occupy rather more space. The records of Acts and of the Epistles, including Peter's own, militate strongly against it. We see in those documents that Paul was especially selected for that city. When for his own safety the chief captain secluded him in the castle, "the Lord stood by him and said: Be of good cheer, Paul, for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem so must thou bear witness also of me in Rome" Thus Paul on account of his wider views was pre-elected to the non-Jewish world, having its nucleus in Greece and Rome, while such of the apostles as could not free themselves from the Jewish law were by that very fact destined to the like-minded in Palestine, in countries further east, or at the utmost to the "Hellenized" at their head-quarters in and around Alexandria. Acts frequently bears witness to this division of labour. Paul in several epistles alludes to the same thing, and more especially in that to the Galatians distinctly states that "the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me (Paul) as that of the circumcision unto Peter"—and "they gave unto me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship that we should go to the heathen and they unto the circumcision (Gal. II. 7, 8, 9). Thus Holy Scripture itself excludes Peter from any part in converting the Byzanto-Romish world and from any participation in founding Churches outside the Orient. The parting of the two, each to his separate sphere of work, took place in A.D. 54; the date is thus verified: Paul was converted in 37; three years afterwards, *i.e.* in 40, he visited Jerusalem (Gal. I. 18). Fourteen years later, that is in 54, he again went to

Digitized by Google

Jerusalem (Gal. II. 1) and met Peter there. He then travelled westwards, the records of his journeys to and teaching in Galatia, Corinth, Athens and elsewhere and his arrival in Rome are well known. The defence of his doctrine before Felix falls in the year 58, and he reached Rome in 61, or very early in 62, where, as he expressly states, no apostle had previously taught (Rom. XVI. 20). This was addressed to the Romans, that is to the very people, which would most easily detect the misstatement had there been such. In Acts (XXVIII. 30) it is recorded that "in Rome Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house." That in so detailed a document no mention of Peter's arrival and sojourn in Rome is made, can only be explicable by the fact that he neither went nor dwelt there; for, be it remembered, that narrative brings apostolic history down to the outbreak of Nero's persecution, in which Paul probably suffered and Peter is alleged by Papists to have perished; but if the latter was bishop there, his name could not possibly have been omitted. The second letter to Timothy was written when Paul was hourly expecting to be led to execution; he was, save for one person, alone. "Only Luke is with me. Take Mark and bring him with thee, for he is profitable to me in the ministry." This desire for the aid of Mark is also significant of Peter's absence. None of the apostolic fathers state that Peter was at any time in Rome; and in regard to Clement, this is very conclusive, for he says, in his letter to the Corinthians, that Peter gained the crown of martyrdom, but mentions neither time nor place. Such reticence would be inexplicable had the death occurred in Rome where he (Clement) was, according to Romish story, ordained bishop by that very apostle.

Another epistle must be mentioned—the first of Peter; it is dated from Babylon and its delivery is

Digitized by Google

entrusted to Silvanus (Silas).... Papists say that when Peter wrote Babylon, he meant Rome; the improbability involved in the assertion amounts very nearly to impossibility, as is shewn in the sequel (p. 9).

This leads to some remarks on the valuation of Romish averment; for that Church early contracted the habit of interpolation, falsification and forgery, which began in the 2nd century and continues to the present day (Chap. XVI), has balefully influenced the evolution of that Church, laid foundations for the most pernicious clauses of canon-law and involved every statement of Rome in grave distrust. This idiosyncrasy is manifest in the subject of the next few pages. But very early in Christian history the motive of such "pious fraud" was not evil; books were then reproduced by writing, the transcribers of religious history or homilies being generally monks having a leaning to one or other set of opinions. Such persons thought it not only harmless, but actually meritorious to modify or change phrases which clashed with their views into such as supported them. But the innocency of motive covered only a very short period, for after the middle of the 4th century distinct purposes—acquisition of power, aggrandizement of sacerdotal status and appropriation of territory—are the aim and object of entire documents; mere baseless fabrications "adorned with the name," such was the euphemism of an early authority. To detect the spurious nature of many such writings is often facile, for in them events are frequently mentioned which did not occur till after the supposed author's death, also other blunders impossible at the date assigned to the document are common; but in other cases the discovery requires much patience and intimate knowledge of the circumstances of the period and of the language or barbarisms that were

Digitized by Google

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

prevalent at the time of the fictive and of the real author; the number of these counterfeits renders it very necessary to examine with especial care all Romish documents that tend to support claims to monies, territories or powers.

We now revert to our more immediate subject. The myth, *i.e.* tradition, of Peter being ever in Rome rests upon no clear historical basis, and in the records that survive there are so many blunders and contradictions that they cannot be accepted as plain straightforward records of fact. It is true that four early writers (about a hundred or more years after the alleged date of Peter's death) speak of the foundation of the Romish Church by him in conjunction with Paul; these will be reverted to. Turning to Eusebius' two great historical works, we come across certain statements, made doubtless in good faith, which can easily be disproved. In the Hist. Eccles. and in the Chronicon the date of his arrival is in some paragraphs fixed as either 39, 40 or 41, the slight variation making no difficulty in acceptation. The former work, however, says (Lib. III. 1) that Peter, after residing seven years in Antioch, travelled through Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia and Asia, preaching to the scattered Jews (Diaspori). The Romish Church-writers fix upon 42, however, as the date of his arrival in Rome. This is irreconcilable with the narrative of Acts; that year was the one in which Herod Agrippa imprisoned this apostle, for that prince only ruled three years; he came from Rome to Jerusalem after Pentecost of 41 (1st year of the Emperor Claudius), and just previous to that feast of the following year began to persecute the Christians; he died early in 44. We take then 42 as a fixed point in the apostle's history. After his miraculous escape from prison he "went into another place": this certainly was not Rome, partly because the mighty mistress of the world would not be so

Digitized by Google

cursorily mentioned, chiefly because by going there he would have fallen into the hands of Claudius, who at that time, anxious to propitiate the tetrarch, would at once have sent him back to Herod. Shortly after that ruler's death in 44, Peter went to Antioch, where, as St. Gregory and others tell us, he remained seven years, interrupted only by two short journeys to Jerusalem (50 and 54), the latter being fixed by Paul's epistle to the Galatians. After that date there is no further mention of Peter in Acts; the reason of which is that he plunged into those regions mentioned by Eusebius and St. Gregory and so was lost to western ken; in no other way is the complete silence of that sacred record explicable, while it continues to recount with considerable detail the doings of Paul; and especially unaccountable is it that while describing the voyage of the Apostle of the Gentiles it should make no mention whatever of any such by Peter—that is it would be unaccountable if such had ever occurred. But after his seven years' stay at Antioch Peter travelled eastward, founding Churches and teaching in a very wide district. He was a poor man, therefore must have travelled afoot, and his wife being with him must have considerably retarded his progress. Mr. Barnes, a recent Jesuit writer, considers that while travelling along the southern shore of the Black Sea he was anxious to earn sufficient money for his support by working at his trade as a fisherman ("St. Peter in Rome," p. 29). All this can only have occurred after 54 (his last meeting with Paul and other apostles). Mr. Barnes further says (p. 24) "Christian (by this word he means Romish) tradition is very definite in stating that for twelve years after the Resurrection, no one of the apostles left Jerusalem"; * if this include the immediate vicinity,

* The Crucifixion and Resurrection took place in 33; the martyrdom of Stephen in 34; the conversion of Paul in 37 (Acts IX.); his

Digitized by Google

the statement may be accepted; this brings the date to 45, then come the seven years in Antioch, making it 52. And yet Peter's arrival in Rome is said in the Hist. Eccles. and Chronicon, as also by certain other writers, to have taken place in 40, that is five years before any one of the apostles left Jerusalem, and twelve years before Peter's stay in Antioch was concluded; moreover, the assertion allows no time for the long journeys in Pontus etc. The most easterly place that Peter visited on the Euxine litoral was Sinope, thence he struck southward, descended the Euphrates valley to Babylon, thence he addressed to those of the diaspori whom he had converted, a letter, the first few lines of which afford to his messenger Silvanus (Silas), direction as to the most convenient method of taking the backward journey, beginning therefore with Pontus. The statement that Peter in dating his letter from Babylon meant Rome is as fictitious as the rest; that term was not applied to the capital till after the appearance of the Apocalypse, and in thus using it the apostle would have antedated history by at least sixteen years. Moreover, though in so allegorical a document as Revelations a pseudonym may be used, such would be inadmissible in the dating of a letter. Peter's history, therefore, after the Resurrection runs thus:

RECORD OF PETER.

A.D.

33.—After Pentecost in Jerusalem and neighbourhood.

40.—At Jerusalem. Paul coming there three years after conversion, visits him; heals Eneas and Dorcas. (Acts IX. and X.; Gal. I. 18.)

first meeting with Peter 40 (Gal. I. 18). The meeting in Jerusalem fourteen years after, (Gal. II. 1) in 54; the contention between Peter and Paul at Antioch cannot have taken place less than one year, probably two years later—say 56.

Digitized by Google

42—4.—Imprisoned by Herod, goes to "another place," in hiding, therefore not to Rome. (Acts XII.)

44—51.—After Herod's death, *i.e.* when safe, superintends the Church at Antioch for seven years. (St. Greg. Epist. VII. 20.)

50.—Goes from Antioch to Jerusalem to attend the council about circumcision, at which James presided and gave judgment (Acts XV.)

51—4.—At various places in Palestine, preaching and confirming the Churches.

54—7.—Meets Paul in Jerusalem; they give each other "the right hand of fellowship." (Gal. II.) He travels and founds Churches in Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, Bithynia, Pontus (St. Jerome) —preaches in the Parthian Kingdom (Origen).

62—5.—Goes down the Euphrates valley to Babylon, addresses thence, not earlier than 65, an epistle to his new converts.

65—7.—In one of these years probably martyred (Clement), during one of the persecutions which, unlike Nero's, spread throughout the empire.

This itinerary is largely supported by Acts, by St. Paul's epistles and by those of several pristine fathers (Irenæus, Origen, Clement). It does not contradict the plain narrative of Scripture as Romish tradition does, nor is it, like that, physically and chronologically impossible.

The Romish Church having against all evidence brought Peter to Rome, makes him bishop there for twenty-five years and relates that he ordained Clement his successor in that office. The latter, as being the simpler statement, may be first taken. The apostle is by Rome said to have been martyred there under Nero (64), Clement assumed the bishopric in 91—between him and the alleged date of the apostle's death are

Digitized by Google

twenty-seven years, filled by the episcopacy of Linus and Anencletus. In order to reconcile the statements with dates, Romish writers emit the supposition that Peter frequently quitted his See in the capital, leaving the above-named as suffragans; the explanation simply shifts the incompatibility, for these might have done his work during his life time, *i.e.* previous to 64, yet such arrangement in no way accounts for the appearance of these names on the roster between 64 and 91. Peter could not have ordained Clement and have provided that two others should fill the office for twenty-seven years previous to such ordination taking effect. And in this connection we come across an evident and purposeful interpolation in two of Eusebius' great works (Chronicon and Hist. Eccles.). Be it remembered that no writer earlier than the above-named (Papias, Hegisippus, Irenæus, Justin, Clement) says a word about Peter having been bishop in Rome. The first surviving list is that of Irenæus (Hegisippus' rota is lost): therein (Adv. Hæret. Lib. III.) it is stated that Linus was "the first bishop, to him succeeded Anencletus, and in the third place from the apostles Clement." Let the perfectly clear statement be noted, that "Linus was the first bishop" and Anencletus the second; after this his numbering down to the twelfth (Eleutherius, his cotemporary) is in perfect order. The author cannot possibly have overlooked such an occurrence as an apostolic bishopric, for he must have known that it could not recur.

Eusebius (Hist. Eccles.) says: "After the martyrdom of Peter and Paul the bishopric of the Romish Church was undertaken by Linus. The second bishop was Anencletus." In Chronicon* we read that in A.D. 40 (five years before he left Jerusalem, p. 9,) Peter was bishop of Rome for twenty-five years, and that in 66

* These works by Eusebius are of about 316—326.

Digitized by Google

Linus "after Peter" held that office, and that Anencletus was "the second bishop," Clement the third, Evaristus the fourth and so on, omitting therefore in this tally to count Peter at all. Thus it is plain that in some indeterminate year after Eusebius' death, probably between 350 and 380, a scribe interpolated the whole passage about Peter's bishopric. This is made clear in a short appendix to this chapter, where quotations as to this alleged bishopric are given at length.*

The credibility of Peter's itinerary as given by Rome is not increased by the incongruity of things alleged to have happened there after his arrival. Many extant writings of this time are influenced by the strife between the Christians of the rigid Jewish branch and those of Pauline views. At the council of Jerusalem Paul had gained sanction of his opinions; but some of the apostles may have but very unwillingly assented and soon slid back into rigid Mosaism, among these were Peter and John, who, the latter more especially, following Paul through a certain portion of his westward journey, induced many who had adopted the freer tenets to undergo the Jewish rite. Paul regarding this as treachery to the Jerusalem decision, called those who so taught "false brethren" and wrote censures to the misled Galatians. The strife was severe. Most of the earliest Church writers belonged to Judæo-Christianity, as did Papias, a writer of the 2nd century, having possibly had personal relations with John. He either speaks inimically of Paul or avoids mention of him altogether, as also of all persons belonging to that branch of the faith; the same, indeed, must be said of Justin and of Hegisippus, although the writings of all three evince know-

* Here attention may be called to the fact that previous to A. D. 300, no writer mentions Peter's bishopric in Rome. There are about this date several instances of interpolations and fabrications, briefly mentioned in the sequel.

Digitized by Google

ledge of the Pauline epistles. In the middle of the 3rd century the Judæo-Christians in Rome promulgated several writings, stigmatizing Paul as "false apostle," "hated of mankind," "ravening wolf," the last being attested by an inscription on a house said to be that of Aquila and Priscilla, the apostle is called wolf by name (in ablative, lupe Paulo). Also taking as type the meeting between Peter and Simon Magus, they thinly mask under that name references to Paul. One of these narrates how Peter hunted him up and down the Phœnician coast, bringing him to bay in Rome. Another, travestied from Acts XV. and Gal. IV., tells that Simon (Paul) opposed not only Peter but also James, and after the latter's death sought the former in order to betray him to Herod. A third legend has it that the sorcerer, captured by Romish soldiers, escaped by magic, but being retaken was conveyed to the capital. This is evidently a falsification of Paul's imprisonment, escape and exemption from the scourge (Acts XVI. and XXIII.) and his journey under guard to the capital.

In still another document (κήρυγμα = sermon) Paul's voyage is described as a flight from Peter's pursuit; even an order from On High, evidently a parody on that given to Paul in the chief captain's house, is plagiarised, but is ascribed to the other apostle. Also it is narrated that this Paulo-Simon caused a statue of himself to be erected, inscribed "Simone Deo Sancto," and worshipped. The locality, an island of the Tiber, is clearly indicated (Hist. Eccles. Lib. II. c. 13) and, indeed, in 1574 a statue engulphed in river mud was found there. It was of a period long anterior to the Christian era, represented a Romo-Sabine god and the inscription ran Semoni Sanco or Sango. Eusebius (Hist. Eccles.) says: "But this impiety did not long avail him, for in the time of the Emperor Claudius * the be-

* In Chronicon of Caius.

Digitized by Google

nign and merciful providence of God guided St. Peter, that greatest of the apostles and prince of all the rest by the merit of his courage, against this curse and pest of the human race." Also in these documents Paulo-Simon is described as having duped a great number, among them Nero who honoured him; Peter confronts him and there follows a contest of thaumaturgic powers, poorly travestied from that of Moses and the Egyptian conjurers. The Magus is of course defeated, and in order to regain his diminished credit proposes to parody the Ascension, and orders his demons (in some variants tamed eagles) to bear him skyward. But Peter, raising aloft his hands, prays that the carriers may let him fall, and the magician is dashed to pieces. Another "tradition" neglects this story, but relates an impious attempt to imitate the Resurrection—Simon, however, remaining buried.

After the generation which cherished this violent hatred of Paul had passed away, a change came over the condition of the Romish Church. The Gentile branch (uncircumcision) had increased in number and influence, the Judaic had decreased in both. The Paulo-Simon myth was in part forgotten, and since it could not be obliterated, Church interest lay in obscuring its meaning. Hence in the documents appearing after the middle of the 2nd century, Simon is sometimes identified with the founder of Gnosticism, sometimes is associated with Peter, no longer as an opponent, but as a cordial co-operator. This association is expressed almost as an article of faith, "the two apostles are conjoined as sun and moon." The arrival of Peter many years before that of Paul enabled the former to receive the latter as an honoured visitor. He, like a royal personage, sent to Puteole some of his retinue as ambassadors, who accompanied the recent arrival in ceremonial progress to Rome, where Peter embraced him; together they encountered Simon,

Digitized by Google

together they taught to heathen and Jew precisely the same doctrine, together they formed in the imperial city a power rival almost to that of Nero, whom they instructed, each one as to the credibility of the other: Peter informing him that "all that Paul says is true," Paul ordering him to "believe what you have heard Peter say; it is as true as if I myself had said it." This marks the late origin of the story. No one in or near the time of Nero could have imagined such an incongruity as the magnificent emperor listening to a fisherman and a tentmaker, repudiated by their own nation and despised by his, each advising him to credit from the mouth of the other things which he ridiculed and soon after tried to stamp out. It also must be remembered that the epoch in which these events are placed is covered by the last few chapters of Acts and by epistles, had they occurred they could not possibly have been omitted. Let us take some others. * The martyrdom of Peter begins immediately after the mythic discomfiture of the Magus in Rome. Nero, enraged at the death of his favourite magician, imprisoned Peter under the guard of Agrippa. The apostle converted many fellow-prisoners, and then chose a subject very singular for a married man who in his journeys was always accompanied by his wife, the duty of feminine abstention. Many women deserted their wifely duties, which caused loud complaints of the men before the Senate. Among the angered ones was Agrippa, and he, as was known to the converts, intended to execute the apostle; they opened the doors of the prison and persuaded him to fly. On his way he met Christ and asked: "Lord, whither goest thou? To be crucified again *(anothen)*" †—whereupon Peter returns to prison and is sent to execution.

* Passio Petri. Πραξεις Πετρου—the same for Paul, and more curious still, the Acts of Peter and Paul.

† Ανωθεν also means top or head down.

Digitized by Google

Arrived at the fatal spot, he ordered the soldiers to turn the cross round and to crucify him head downward. There are many mechanical difficulties in the way of such an act, indeed it could not be done at all on a cross with short head-piece such as would certainly have been provided. If Peter's execution occurred during Nero's persecution, the soldiers were certainly busy; to their ideas Peter would be one of that pestilent set who had criminally fired Rome, and they would not have undertaken a great deal of trouble to satisfy what must have appeared to them the insensate crotchet of fear-driven lunacy. The fable was not much credited at the time, as Origen shows by telling it with the introduction, "but if any one wishes to accept those words mentioned in the acts of Paul as being spoken by the Saviour." However, it became a "tradition," a church in the Via Appia being named "Quo vadis?" As soon as he was fixed, supernatural personages, among them Christ, appeared and handed to a radiant man a lecture which he read aloud. Nero had intended to subject Peter to prolonged torture; disappointed, he beheaded Agrippa and persecuted Peter's converts, but the deceased apostle thrashed him soundly and promised him worse treatment did he not cease from his cruelties.

Other appearances of the ghost are described, but it is more important for us to learn what became of the body, and on this point we are favoured with a large choice of irreconcilable traditions or myths. In the oldest MS. and in the least garbled copies, shining men from the East bore the corpse back to Jerusalem; but this did not at all suit the Rome of a few years later. The love for and veneration of relics had rendered necessary for that Church, if it were successfully to claim a supremacy, the possession of martyrized apostles; but its complete ignorance of where that body might be, gave rise to many myths,

Digitized by Google

some of which may be related. The oldest, as already mentioned, states that certain Orientals bore the body to Jerusalem; another, that this attempt was frustrated by an earthquake, taking this as a sign that Heaven disapproved their design, they buried the corpse on the Ostian road near a fir-tree. In a third account, Claudius, a devout convert, anointing and embalming the corpse, buried it in the Vatican. Another variant has it that the matrons Anastasia and Basilissa interred it in the Catacombs. In a Syrian MS. Linus deposited it near the Appian way. The Acts of Peter and Paul and the calendar of the Church (Liberius) also mention the fir-tree, but elsewhere this is instead described as the spot where Paul was decapitated. All the accounts fall into inextricable confusion; places referred to in some documents as those of execution are in other described as sites of burial. Five different sets of people are introduced as taking charge of the body, which they respectively deposit in the Ostian road, the Appian way, the Vatican, the Catacombs, San Sebastian, where (Liber Pontiff) it remained from 258 to 330. The same work says that Anencletus erected his tombstone in the Vatican, another work speaks of the trophy (τροπαιον) as marking the place of burial, and Eusebius (Chronicon) relates that Peter was buried in the Catacombs. For the relic-loving reasons above mentioned, the Romish Church was in the third century and still more so in the fourth, anxious to prove the possession of Peter's body; Bishop Damasus (366—384) zealous in this direction, wrote a verse and chose out of all these places San Sebastian, and a curious double grave, or rather some stones arranged in such form, are shewn in the vault, but separated from the catacomb. The strophe of Damasus clearly states that in his time neither body nor bones was in that grave, but plenty were procurable in the catacombs. When two sets of bones had been

Digitized by Google

selected, churches or shrines were necessary for their reception, and as additional voucher that the city possessed such valuable relics; but careful study of dates and documents shows that the selected bones could not have been placed there previous to the consulate of Tuscus and Bassus (258), when those objects are stated to have been removed. The object apparently was to reconcile some of the above discrepancies; but the result was increased confusion, for the story of Anencletus raising a monument over the body of "sancti beati Petri," conflicts with the story of removing those remains from the catacombs. On the alleged house of Aquila and Priscilla is an inscription which states that Peter frequently "preached there and sacrificed to the Lord;" the use of this word "sacrifice" marks the much later date of the phrase, and indeed de Rossi assigns the whole to the sixth century. Engraved jewels and bas-reliefs, said to be portraits of Peter, are utterly unreliable evidence. Peter, though converted to Christianity, still considering the Mosaic laws authoritative, would have regarded with horror and have sternly forbidden any attempt to make a graven image in his likeness. The multitude of objects still shewn at Rome as connected with Peter, are valueless evidence. It is as easy to fabricate a picture or an intaglio as a document; for instance, as that latest addition to canonical non-apocryphal writings which goes by the name of the 2nd Epistle of Peter. But when it was fabricated, Rome was most anxious to ascribe the foundation of its Church to the two most prominent apostles, united in the closest friendship, therefore the writer ascribes to Peter the words "Our dear brother Paul" (2 Pet. III. 15). But that latter, describing how "James, Cephas and John gave to him the right hand of fellowship," evidently indicates it to have been a farewell previous to the departure of each party to his own sphere of influence.

Digitized by Google

Those three firmly believing in the necessity of the Hebrew tribal rite, could not possibly work in the same city harmoniously with one who wrote "if ye receive circumcision, Christ will profit you nothing." (Gal. V. 2.) It was indeed this teaching and its vehemence that excited Judæo-Christian wrath, earned for Paul the vituperative names above given, and made it impossible for Peter or any other Jew to work with him.

Therefore all the legends irreconcilable with each other, with the indisputable narrative of Acts, and with apostolic epistles, are useful in a direction contrary to that which was intended—namely, they clearly shew the great straits to which the Romish Church was put to claim the life, bishopric and death, but more especially the body in its city, of a man who never lived and therefore could not have died there.

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER I

THE LIST OF THE FIRST TWELVE ROMISH BISHOPS ACCORDING TO IRENÆUS

"THE blessed Apostles having founded and built up the Church, committed into the hands of Linus the office of the episcopate. Of this Linus St. Paul makes mention in his epistle to Timothy. To him succeeded Anencletus and after him in the third place from the apostles Clement was allotted to the bishopric ***. To this Clement succeeded Evaristus; Alexander followed Evaristus, then sixth from the apostles Xystus (Sixtus)." (We now abbreviate.) 7th Telephorus, 8th Hyginus, 9th Pius, 10th Anicetus, 11th Soter. Eleutherius does in the 12th place from the apostles now hold the inheritance of the episcopate. As Eleutherius was bishop from 177 to 192, the date of this writing can be fixed within a year or two.

THE LIST OF THE FIRST FEW ROMISH BISHOPS ACCORDING TO EUSEBIUS. HIST. ECCLES. LIB. III. *

AFTER the martyrdom of Paul and Peter, Linus was made first Romish bishop ***. The second in the Church of the Romans was Anencletus, and the third Romish bishop was Clement ***. Then Evaristus as the fourth ruled the Church ***. After his death

* This history does not limit itself to the Church of Rome, but records also the succession of Alexandrian bishops and sundry events in the empire. The asterisks mark the places where these intervene between the records of Romish episcopal succession.

Digitized by Google

Alexander became fifth bishop after Peter and Paul. When Alexander, Bishop of Rome, had held the office for ten years, he died; Xystus succeeded him;—so on, through many more numbered in the same way as Irenæus—*i.e.*, in Eusebius' Ecclesiastic History Peter is neither named nor reckoned numerically as a bishop of Rome.

So far all is clear and straight, but we pass to Chronicles which, like the Historia, records a great number of events; such as do not affect our subject are omitted. The italics indicate the passages which have been interpolated.

The apostle Peter, after he had founded the Church of Antioch, was sent to Rome, where preaching the Gospel, he continued to be bishop for XXV. years.

After Peter Linus first held the Roman Church for twelve years.

Anencletus was made second bishop of the Roman Church for twelve years.

The third Roman bishop was Clement, for nine years. Evaristus fourthly undertook the episcopacy for nine years.

And now we may abbreviate. 5th Alexander, 6th Xystus, 7th Telephorus, 8th Hyginus, 9th Pius, 10th Anicetus, 11th Soter, 12th Eleutherius.

These numbers agree with those of Eusebius' other work and more important still with Irenæus; but are quite at variance with such as would stand if Peter had been bishop. The words in italics were therefore evidently interpolated after the middle of the 5th century. *

* Eusebius in two other places of the history speaks of Linus as first bishop.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER II

DISSENSION

Think not that I am come to send peace on the earth.

STRIFE among the new religionists was not confined to that division between the upholders of the Judaic and of the Gentile branches. Even during the apostolic age there were varieties of opinion in religious matters, some of which St. Paul considered inevitable, therefore however regrettable, not blameworthy (1 Cor. XI. 19) others he classes with sundry palpable sins (Gal. V. 20). The word in Greek is *αἱρεσεις*, meaning "view" or "opinion," and it does not necessarily denote any culpability, although later—*i.e.* about the middle of the 4th century—it became always or chiefly a term of opprobrium. When Christianity in its spread, merged beyond the slaves into the more cultivated classes, it was studied and compared with philosophies, chiefly Platonism Aristotelian, Stoic, and especially with the system of Philo, an Alexandrine and Hellenized Jew, to whose speculations the incorporation of the "logos" into Christian doctrine is principally due. Among the ardent students of philosophical systems, the divine teaching became an additional subject for subtle disputation rather than a guide for conduct. The mode of incarnation, the doctrine of the Trinity, the resemblances to, or differences between, the Son and the Father, and many other insoluble mysteries were the subjects of endless dispute and the origin of very

Digitized by Google

many different opinions or "haireseis." To even cursorily describe the many variations of opinion would fill volumes, even to name them many pages, of unreadable matter. St. Augustine (Ep. 222) tells us there were 128 heresies in the Church; therefore, merely now remarking that an objection to the election of one particular bishop rather than of another was in later times included among heresies, we pass on to two important divergencies which bore much baleful fruit: the Donatist and the Arian. The former will occupy but little space, it was in reality a mere dispute as to whether Cœcilian or Majorinus had greater claim to the bishopric of Carthage. During the century between 311 and 411 the strife continued, with much ruffianism and a great deal of swearing on either side; but we now are chiefly interested in its origin and especially in Constantine's endeavours to mitigate the fierce rancour of contending parties. That emperor, by his victory of the Milvian Bridge, had become (12th March, 312,) sole ruler of the West. Six months after he issued "the Edict of Milan," securing toleration of Christianity and, as he had hoped, peace between that hairesis and his pagan subjects; but, much to his surprise, was almost at once plunged into the fiery atmosphere of the Donatist schism, and soon became aware that, though a concord might reign between the ancient and the new religion, sharp discords prevailed in the latter, leading sometimes to acts of violence and bloodshed. In vain did he use efforts, both conciliatory and punitive, the contention was irrepressible. Still more grieved was he by further evidence that the community he had joined was not living in "... the unity of the spirit and the bond of peace," for while still engaged in pouring oil on the troubled waters of Donatism another and more important contention arose, this time in Alexandria, the bishop of which Church had excommunicated and deprived for

Digitized by Google

opinions differing from his own, its presbyter Arius. The views of this latter, taken up by a large proportion of clerics throughout Christendom, spread so widely that, after 319, the whole Church was divided into parties, viz., those that held the same hairesis as the bishop and those that adhered to the opinions of the presbyter of Alexandria. The watchwords of the two were respectively "homoousion" and "homoiousion". Constantine of necessity became enveloped in this atmosphere of strife, which policy no less than piety urged him to mitigate. Accordingly he wrote to the two at Alexandria suggesting a formula, which he hoped might, by including both shades of credence, culminate in mutual agreement. Theologic rancour was not, however, to be easily assuaged, therefore, in the following year, he summoned a meeting for discussion and settlement of the controversy. This, the first great council of the West, met in Nicæa, hence is called the Nicene. It was entirely due to the initiative of the first Christian emperor and was conducted by him in person. Its methods and procedures are described by Eusebius, who actually assisted at it. The matter is one of extreme importance as later writers (Binius, Labbœus, Baronius etc.) have misrepresented pretty nearly all the events. Eusebius mentions by the name of their sees all or nearly all the bishops, who, coming, many of them, from very distant places, were present; he of Rome was absent, nor does this contemporary history mention that he sent any representative. This phrase must, however, be quoted: "The prelate of the imperial city was prevented from attending by extreme old age; but his presbyter being present supplied his place." By "imperial city" Eusebius must have meant Constantinople, where the emperor resided, for in 325 Sylvester of Rome was not an old man, indeed he continued in office ten years longer. Neither does Sozomen's

Digitized by Google

account mention the presence, personal or by proxy, of the Romish bishop. Significant of the emperor's regret at finding his new co-religionists quarrelling so bitterly, are the words he used in explaining the cause of calling the assembly: "As soon as I heard that intelligence, which I had least expected to receive, I mean the news of your dissensions, I judged it to be of no secondary importance, but with the earnest desire that a remedy for this evil might also be found through my means, I immediately sent to require your attendance." After a few more words he asked the bishops for their opinions, and they immediately began to quarrel again: "The emperor gave patient audience to all alike and received every proposition with steadfast attention, and by occasionally helping the arguments of each party in turn he gradually disposed the most vehement disputants to reconciliation." The historian also gives an account, which need not be here quoted, of the respectful or, rather, humble reception by the bishops of the emperor as he, amid awe-struck silence, took the presidential seat; and goes on to relate how Constantine pronounced condemnation of Arius and forbade any one bishop to reproach or censure another on account of these dissensions now, he hoped, allayed; also how he wrote letters to every city announcing the result of the council; how "he deposed two bishops of his own authority and they were banished according to imperial edicts." The whole record, as also that of Sozomen, shews that the inception of the summons to the council, and the reconcilement of mutually hostile haireseis were, unprompted by any bishop, entirely the patient work of Constantine, who, if he sought any episcopal counsel at all, consulted those of Antioch, Carthage, Athens, perhaps also Alexandria, and certainly not of Rome, who was absent from Nicæa and at too great a distance to be able

Digitized by Google

to advise.* The importance of noting this history will become more evident to the reader in subsequent chapters.

Another result of the Nicene Council must not pass unnoticed. The adoption or at least the more exclusive use, by those who carried through their views, of a certain designation, viz., Catholic (καθολικος), which means universal; but seeing that Arianism, though discomfited at the Council, was by no means extinct and that there were at least eighty-four (Augustine) other divergencies, the united members of which far outnumbered the adherents of the Nicene formulæ, the name is far from being justified. Moreover, the triumphant ones of the Council gave to the word heresy an opprobrious meaning—it now became not merely a term of reproach, but, though less palpably than in after years, an actual danger, that is a heretic, one holding views divergent from those of Nicæa, was liable to be assailed by those whose opinions were consonant with those of the Council.

It has just been said that Arianism was by no means extinct; the originator of those views had, with many of his followers, been disgraced and banished; but in less than three years after the Council, Constantine, swayed by his sister, modified his opinions; he recalled Arius and his supporter, Eusebius of Nicomedia, to court and desired Athanasius, who had succeeded to the bishopric of Alexandria, to reinstate him presbyter in that Church. The steadfast bishop refused and was banished to Trier (336). Arius, being sent to Alexandria to resume his former position, was resisted by a dangerous mob; he was recalled to Constantinople, where the bishop, at the command of the emperor, was reluctantly about to re-admit him into the Church,

* The pretended letter of the Council requesting Sylvester of Rome to ratify its proceedings is a very clumsy forgery; its barbarisms are of the 8th or 9th century.

Digitized by Google

when he mysteriously died or, more probably, was murdered (stabbed in the abdomen).

But the Arian doctrine continued the creed of a large part of Christendom; not only did many of Byzanto-Roman nationality embrace it, but the peoples of Gaul and Germany—the Huns, Goths, Vandals and Longobardi even now or soon after beginning to flood into Europe—converted by the Arian Ulphilas and others, were almost to a man of that faith. The two chiefly opposing beliefs were again and again discussed, apparently settled, reopened, and quarrelled over afresh. The Council of Ancyra in 356 was followed, between that date and 387, by eleven other meetings. Helvicus Marcellus describes the roads as crowded with "bishops galloping hard to take part in the contention." So meticulous were the disputations that even the strong-minded Athanasius declared his brain to be quite confused by the multiform argumentation. St. Hilary, Bishop of Poictiers, who, for declining to embrace Arianism, now again in the ascendant, had been banished to Asia, declared that in his ten provinces even bishops were ignorant of God (verum Deum nesciunt). "It is a thing," wrote he, "equally deplorable and dangerous, that there are among men as many creeds as opinions, as many doctrines as inclinations, and as many sources of blasphemy as there are errors; because we make creeds arbitrarily and interpret them as arbitrarily. The homoousion is rejected and received and explained away by successive synods. The partial or total resemblance of the Son to the Father is in these unhappy times a subject of dispute. Every year, aye! every month we make new creeds to define indefinable mysteries, we repent what we have done, we defend those repented of, and then we anathematize them. We condemn the doctrine of others in ourselves and our own doctrine in others, and so rending one another, have caused our own and others' ruin."

Digitized by Google

This well describes the uncertain and contentious state of divergent credencies for many years after Nicæa had named one set of fluctuating opinions or haireseis universal (catholic).

Regrettable disturbances concerning the appointment of St. Chrysostom, his deposition, his banishment by the Empress Eudoxia, keeping the Church for seven years in constant turmoil and Constantinople in continual riot, may here be passed over in favour of more important occurrences. Since the middle of the 4th century, the populace had manifested a tendency to pay high honour to Mary, mother of the Lord, gradually the idea spread to, and became adopted by, the clerics. *

About the year 410 the body, or what was said to be the body of Mary was brought to and interred at Ephesus, thus giving additional impulse to worship under the title recently come into use: theotokos = mother of God. The translation hardly gives the true sense of the original, which did it not sound irreverent, would be better rendered by God-generator—God-breeder. Nestorius of Constantinople was shocked by this name, preached and wrote strongly against the deification of a creature. Cyril of Alexandria more violently defended it; this latter appealed to Celestine, Bishop of Rome, who, delighted at the opportunity, sided with Cyril. The violent character of this blood-stained man is well known; both history and romance recount his brutal massacre of the Alexandrian Jews and the martyrdom he inflicted on the

* At this time paganism, a large part of which was worship of womanhood, was still the religion of very many; on conversion they did not at once abrogate their previous habit. As early as 350 (about) Epiphanius censured Collyridian women calling themselves priestesses of Mary. bringing to her offerings of small thin loaves, then eating them in common as an act of worship. Nearly all the dogmata and practices instinctively Romish have arisen in popular superstitions gradually incorporated into the Church.

Digitized by Google

spotless Hypatia. A council at Ephesus (431) was called by the Patriarch of Constantinople, approved by the emperor in order to settle the deipara question. Cyril took with him a great number of bludgeon-men from the monastery of Nitria, sailors and a better-armed retinue. The whole scene at Ephesus was one of violence and bloodshed. Cyril, forced on the opening of the business before the appointed time in order to forestall the arrival of those (especially John of Antioch) who were of Nestorius' views. When they arrived he turned some out of the chamber and excluded others. The cathedral and several churches were attacked and defended by troops of armed clerics and monks. The demons of disorder and theologic hatred were let loose in the unhappy town; the disgusted emperor exclaiming, "God does bear witness that I am not the author of this confusion," dissolved the council and sent Cyril away under guard, he, however, escaping, returned to Africa, whence he sent emissaries laden with gold. Every woman and eunuch surrounding the emperor received a price; the churches and shrines of Alexandria were despoiled of their treasures and were burdened with a debt of £60,000. Few scenes in history are more disgraceful than this clerical assembly; but Cyril attained his objects. Nestorius was disgraced and banished, Mary was God-generator, and he himself—rioter and homicide—was in due course a saint. The whole abominable row is the third Œcumenical Council.

It seems very strange that such rancour and ferocity should be cultivated by those who professed themselves to be the followers and the ministers of the beneficent Gospel with its teaching of charity and love, yet so it was even as early in priestly history as 240, when Tertullian thus wrote, apostrophizing the unconverted: "Ye are fond of spectacles. Expect the greatest of all; the last and eternal judgment

Digitized by Google

of the world? How shall I admire, how laugh, how rejoice, how exult when I behold so many proud monarchs and imagined gods groaning in the lowest abyss of darkness, how many magistrates who persecuted the name of the Lord liquefying in fiercer fires than they ever kindled against the Christians, so many sage philosophers reddening in hottest flames with their deluded pupils, so many celebrated poets trembling before the tribunal, not of Minos, but of Christ, so many fine singers wax tuneful in the expression of their tortures, so many dancers turning their wanton limbs" and so on. Such temper as this accounts in part for clerical ferocities which continued into much later ages. The pretext of zeal for unity of belief but thinly masked grim resolve to tyrannize, to grind all under the sacerdotal heel; to demur was rebellion calling for such savage blasphemy as this: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost and of the Blessed Virgin Mary, by the baptism of Peter and of Paul and of all the other Saints in Heaven, we do hereby curse and cut off from our communion him who has thus rebelled against us. May this curse strike him in his house, barn, bed, field, path, city, castle. May he be accursed in battle, accursed in praying, in speaking, in silence, in eating, in drinking, in sleeping. May he be accursed in his taste, smelling, hearing and all his senses. I conjure thee Devil and all thine imps that ye take no rest till ye have brought him to eternal shame, till he is destroyed by drowning, hanging, till he is torn to pieces by wild beasts and consumed by fire. Let his children be orphans and his wife a widow. I command thee Devil and all thine imps that, even as I now do blow out this candle, ye do immediately extinguish the light of his eyes. So be it. So be it. Amen, Amen." This sacerdotal view of Christ's teaching is especially characteristic of the

Digitized by Google

Romish Church. Some centuries later, as the work assigned to Satan bore little visible result, Romish clerics did it themselves. Pius IX.'s and Leo XIII.'s ardent wish to use force is only the desire of expressing in action what in the above is told in words. (See Chaps. XIII. and XVI.) Our immediate subject, Church quarrels and the intrusion into Christianity of alien and unwarranted practices, may now be resumed. Up to about 300 the devout had the greatest horror of images or eidola. St. Paul and St. John had warned against them, they were regarded as demoniac. But about the middle of the 2nd century this feeling became modified, and at the beginning of the 4th the adhesion of Constantine to the faith caused the influx of many but partially converted, following rather the dictates of fashion than assured conviction. These could not comprehend worship without a material recipient of prayer; the images and pictures of martyrs became so much the object of adoration, that the Synod of Elvira (336) found it necessary to forbid this idolatry. * Nevertheless, representations of martyrs and sancti continued to be introduced into churches and devotional books, though, as far as can be ascertained, unauthorized by any decree or announcement. This materialist trend so increased during the next few centuries among all but the Ebionites, that churches, streets and roads were, in the middle of the 8th century, fuller of graven images for worship than they had been in the bloom-time of paganry. Against these objects the Emperor Leo (the Isaurian) began a campaign which, involving all Christendom, lasted for nearly two centuries. Some account of this "iconoclastic strife" is given in Chapter VII. Suffice it here to say that the upholders of images triumphed, since which the worship of icons or eidola—alias idolatry,

* Picturas in ecclesia esse non debitur ne quod colitur et adoretur in parietibus depingatur.

Digitized by Google

has been one of the many unscriptural characteristics of the Romish Church.

A future chapter describes certain antagonisms between the Churches headed by Constantinople and those under the leadership of Rome; each of them were desirous of supremacy over the whole range of Christendom. In the words of the old writer, "Rome would tolerate no equal, Constantinople no superior." The former was of monarchical constitution, the bishop was called, after 650, the Pope, ruling in reality both the "Sacred College" and the State. The latter was rather an oligarchy, of which the patriarch was the head, governing through the medium of councils, and having easier access than Rome to the imperial ear. Much friction and irritation resulted, and many eastern patriarchs resented Romish attempts to override them, and, more especially, arbitrary alterations and evasions of conciliar enactments. At length Rome tampered with the wording of the Nicene Creed by adding two words to the clause concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost; the thing occurred thus: The words Filioque were first thus used at the Synod of Toledo to combat certain developments of Arianism (589), but attracted so little attention that neither the 3rd Council of Constantinople (681) nor the 2nd of Nicæa (787) took notice of them. The use of the words in the creed had spread north of the Alps and the Pyrenees, over Austrasia and Neustria, and in 809 Charlemagne assembled a meeting at Aachen, where this novelty was adopted, and wrote to Leo III. requesting its ratification; the Pope declined. Nevertheless, political exigencies prevailed and the point was yielded at Rome. The East opposed it; the Patriarch Photius stigmatized it as a great error; the 4th Council of Constantinople anathematized it (869). The Romish popes had to be very cautious, and in fact Benedict VIII. (1012—1024) was the first to overtly use it. In the

Digitized by Google

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

meantime many causes for friction between the two main branches had arisen. More than once each had severed communion with the other and banned each others prelates or excluded their names from sacerdotal annals; at last Leo IX. (1049—54) excommunicated the whole Grecian community and the Patriarch Cerularius. At once the Eastern reciprocated the amenities of the Western branch, and a complete separation, lasting to the present day, occurred. All attempts at reconciliation have failed; the two, separated, are not unfriendly; but efforts at reunion only result, and can only result, in quarrelling. Yet each calls itself universal (catholic) and to this title one has as much and as little right as the other.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER III

PAPAL MANNERS

By their fruits ye shall know them.

A FEELING is widely prevalent that during the first few centuries of Christianity, its votaries and ministers were very devout and pure, and this may up to a certain point be accepted; but the period when such condition obtained is bounded within very narrow limits. Even before persecutions had ceased, clerical immorality must have been largely prevalent, for the Council of Nicæa on account of a few rare cases would hardly have formulated its third canon, which forbids bishops and priests to keep in their houses "*feminæ subintroductæ*," under the guise of cousins, nieces, or servants. About forty years after that meeting, more complete evidence is available in the writings of St. Jerome, who thus describes the manners of Romish clerics: "They desire the deaconship or priesthood that they may more readily have access to women; all their care is for dress, they curl their hair and point their toes, more like young bridegrooms than priests." In a letter, he thus describes the dwelling and surroundings of a young patrician widow. "With artistically rouged cheeks she reclines upon a splendid sofa, the Gospel bound in purple and gold in her hand. Her chamber is full of priestly parasites who well know how to delight her with scandals concerning lay or sacerdotal events; she is charmed at

Digitized by Google

being the patroness of priests, others of whom come to pay her visits; they kiss the noble lady on the head, extending at the same time an eager hand to receive her gracious gifts; if they pocket these with a certain bashfulness, the monks do so much more boldly as they are shewn out, of course with gifts, by the slaves. But the richly dressed eunuchs widely throw open the door for the deacon, as he checks at the entrance his fiery horses, as though he were own brother to the King of Thrace. Sweet are his silken garments with many perfumes; his hair is by a skilful barber artfully curled with the heated iron. With much beringed fingers he foppishly raises the skirt of his cloak as he trips into the palace on charming feet, decked by the shoemaker's best art with embroidered morocco slippers. The beholder will be more apt to take him for some fair lady's dainty swain than for a pillar of the Church. He is known all over the city as 'town driver' (veredarius urbis) and the street urchins shout after him 'pipizzo' and 'geranopipa.' He is seen everywhere yet nowhere; nothing happens but that he is the first to know it, nor is there a bit of gossip which he has not either invented or magnified. His mode of life shortly described is this: He has become a priest that he may more readily visit beautiful ladies; as soon as he is awake he considers what those visits are to be and then he starts on his rounds. Should he see in any house something beautiful and valuable, be it a cushion, a table cover, or some utensil, he admires it, takes it and holds it in his hands until at last it is given him, for every lady dreads the inventive tongue of the veredarius." St. Jerome is not the first to identify the apocalyptic Babylon with Rome: "Read, aye! read the Revelations: there you will see what is said of that woman clothed in scarlet, who bears on her forehead a blasphemous name—she of the seven hills and of many waters—and the end of

Digitized by Google

that imperial town. Truly there is a Holy Church; one sees there the relics of saints and martyrs, and there the doctrine of Jesus Christ is confessed, but corruption, pride and grandeur have there destroyed all piety." More evidence is to be found in the writings of St. Gregory Nazianzen, of St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom etc. One other quotation will suffice, it is from Ammianus Marcellus, a historian contemporary of St. Jerome, who, in describing disgraceful faction fights that placed Damasus in the episcopal chair, writes thus: "When I see the splendour of Rome I am not surprised that those who wish to become bishops there should do all that is possible to attain their object, for that bishopric gives them an assured position; they live in riches, upon the presents of ladies; they drive in carriages sumptuously furnished, are splendidly attired, and have such good cheer that their tables surpass those of kings; they might be more truly good if, dispensing with the luxury of Rome, they would imitate the simple lives of some rural prelates, and by the plainness of their food and by modesty of dress make themselves acceptable to the eternal God." So successful were the higher ecclesiastics in obtaining from ladies large donations and testamentary dispositions in their favour, that the result became seriously detrimental, and a law was framed to forbid clerical legacy and gift hunting; its wording points to the immoral manner of inducement. "We forbid clerics, or those who say they have taken vows of chastity and celibacy, to enter the houses of widows and wards, and they shall not be permitted to profit by the liberality of these women, into whose graces and familiarity they have insinuated themselves, under the guise of religion. We ordain that if such woman have given them anything, even in her last will, it shall be null, and they shall be unable to acquire anything either by gift or testament, not even

Digitized by Google

through the intervention of a fiduciary or other third person; and if it should happen that after this decree they should capture either by gift or testament of such woman any property, that property shall be confiscated."* (Cod. Theodat. lib. XVI.) By these and other means the wealth of the higher clergy became so enormous that even rich patricians envied them, as did Pretextatus, who replied to Damasus' attempts to convert him by: "If you will make me Bishop of Rome, I will at once become a Christian." These riches were again and again employed in purchasing the highest positions in the Church, therefore we must now consider the methods by which these, even the bishopric of Rome,† was frequently, one might say usually procured. The theory of that Church is that the Holy Ghost presides invisibly over and directs the election, in other words the choice is that of the Almighty Trinity. To gain that election by bribery (simony), violence, or murder alienates the Spirit, who by His very nature cannot consort with evil. Hence one having been by such means successful has no indwelling of the Paraclete and cannot therefore transmit him to successors. Nor can one, even though his election have been pure, retain the fellowship of the Holy Ghost if his subsequent conduct be evil either by salacity or by traffic (whether pecuniary or violent) with sacerdotal ordinations. The practice of the Romish Church has been, however, from a very early age an utter contradiction of its theory; with regard to the sale of preferments, even of arch- and of simple bishoprics, nothing very definite need in this place be said, as the sequel affords ample examples

* Much later, Gregory. VII. (1073—85) captured by these means from the Countess Matilda, if her alleged will be genuine, large territories.

† The title "Papa" was, previous to 600, the designation of all priests, as it is now in the Greek Church—at that date the potentate of Rome limited its use to himself.

Digitized by Google

of most cynical traffic. We begin with the violent capture of the Romish bishopric after the death of Liberius (366) forty-one years after the Council of Nicæa. Ursicinus was chosen by one party, Damasus by another; strife indistinguishable from civil war ensued, the slaughter was frightful, in one church alone one hundred and thirty-seven dead were gathered on a single day; incendiarism, murder, violent lust, reigning supreme, were the methods by which the latter ringleader seized the episcopate. In 418 Eulalius and Boniface, suborning ruffians, filled Rome with bloodshed and outrage. Again 498 saw a repetition of the same infamous conduct when Symmachus and Laurentius levied war on each other; this strife was even more barbarous than the two previously mentioned, and it lasted nearly five years in spite of the conciliatory efforts of several synods and of King Theodoric. Each candidate accused the other, apparently with truth, of very horrible crimes; a meeting of clerics, commissioned by the king to investigate the charges, evaded any decision save "We leave the whole matter in the hand of God," which means that, unwilling to condemn, they could not acquit. Again in 530 two rivals fought; Boniface II. prevailed; his rival, or, as people said, his victim Dioscurus died in three weeks. The bishop's vengeance then fell on his supporters; so truculent were his acts, so indecently violent the anathemas he placed on the records of the Church, that, at the request of all the Romish clerics, a successor, Agapetus, publicly burnt them. The ruthless starving to death by Vigilius of his rival Sylverius is characteristic, not of theologic, for no doctrine was involved, but of papal or demoniac hate. During the course of the next thousand years there occurred very many instances of capturing the coveted Romish bishopric by violence and by more or less secret murder; but their number sinks into

Digitized by Google

insignificance when compared to the instances of procuring it by bribery. In studying the pages of Baronius, Binius, Anastatius etc., all historians and panegyrists of the papacy, one finds that but very few obtained the chair by other means, and of these few most were placed there by kings or emperors, as substitutes for some one they had dethroned because their misconduct had passed the limit of the bearable. Among the many crimes Boniface's document above mentioned laid to the charge of his rival was simony; but, according to Anastasius, such was the very sin by which he procured the chair. Clearly this was merely aggravation of a common evil, for laws are not made to meet isolated acts, and at this time the Roman Senate decreed: "If anything have been given or promised either by the individual himself or by an intermediary for the purpose of obtaining the bishopric, the contract shall be void, and whatever may have been so given shall be restored." Nevertheless, at that pope's death (532) the next man bought the bishopric by such enormous bribery as to cause complaint to King Athalric that "several electors had been promised huge payment out of Church property, which was being alienated even down to the sacred vessels." In 687 Pope Conon had bequeathed a large accumulation of money to the poor; immediately his death occurred Archdeacon Paschal seized the treasure and promised it, or a large part of it, to John, Patriarch of Ravenna, if he should place him on the chair; but the people would have none of him, and elected Sergius I. Another scene of tumult occurred and Paschal could not obtain his desire; but he stuck to Conon's money, refusing to give any to John, whereupon that cleric broke into St. Peter's and despoiled it of valuables, at least equal to the amount he had hoped to get from the archdeacon. Too much space would be occupied by quoting the innumerable

Digitized by Google

instances of simony occurring through the following ten centuries; they are of course denied by papalists and ascribed to what they are pleased to call "protestant calumny," but the decree of Senate just quoted is sufficient proof as to early venality, while for later times the following bull of Julius II. (1503—13) decisively proves the prevalence of the evil. "Whosoever procures the suffrage of any cardinal by promise, obligation or contract made by himself or another, though his election be accomplished by the unanimous vote of the whole College of Cardinals and even confirmed by adoration, it is nevertheless VOID and of NO EFFECT and the person so tainted with simoniacal heresy is to be accounted no Pope or Bishop of Rome, but an Apostate and Arch-heretic, incapable of all manner of jurisdiction and authority in matters both ecclesiastical and temporal, and from that time forth is deprived (even without any declaration) of his cardinalship and all other benefices and dignities whatsoever; nor can any subsequent acts of obedience done by him, by the cardinals, enthronement or lapse of time make good his unlawful assumption of the pontifical chair."

But probably enough has now been said concerning illicit means of getting into the chair, and therefore the story may take up the conduct of its captors, which was very frequently such as to render its description hardly readable without a horrible sense of disgust and shame. Yet some quotations, taken from writers strongly favourable to Romish institutions, may be given. In speaking of the 10th century, Baronius says: "Before commencing this unhappy century, the reader must allow me to warn him, lest his very soul be scandalized when he sees the abomination of desolation in the very temple of God. How deformed, how hideous was the aspect of the Church of Rome, when it was governed solely by shameless prostitutes, who at their pleasure changed and changed

Digitized by Google

again the popes, disposed of bishoprics and, what is still more terrible, placed in the holy seat of St. Peter their paramours and their bastards." Platina, Genebrardus and Stella write in a like strain; there were in that century "at least thirty popes who were robbers, murderers, secret poisoners, magicians, simonists, monsters, perjurers, church-plunderers and infamous criminals." Muratori, a Romish historian, writing in the earlier half of the 18th century, of whom Pope Benedict XIV. highly approved, says: "In the 10th century more especially, what unheard of monsters filled, alas! not only the seats of bishops, but also that of St. Peter." "Since all women in his diocese were his spiritual daughters, he corrupted and polluted nearly all." (Ratherius.)

The above are all from papal authors, the following, though from a protestant, cannot therefore be regarded as calumny. "Nothing is more incontrovertible than that the sacred order (priesthood) was composed chiefly of men who were illiterate, stupid, ignorant of every thing pertaining to religion, libidinous, superstitious and flagitious. Nor can anyone doubt that those who wished to be regarded as the fathers and guardians of the Universal Church, were the principal causes of these evils. Nothing certainly can be imagined so filthy, criminal and wicked as to be deemed incompatible with their characters, they who where the supreme directors of religion and its rites. Nor was any government ever so loaded with vices of every kind as that which passed for the most holy .... That the history of Romish bishops in this century is a history not of men but of monsters, a history of the most atrocious villainies and crimes, is acknowledged by all the best writers, including even those who plead for papal authority." *

* Hist. Eccl. Mosheim, a most conscientious and moderate historian. The first edition bears date 1737.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Digitized by Google

These censures are fully justified, only the epoch is too restricted, for they apply equally to a much earlier and far later period. During the whole of the Middle Ages, save for a few short intervals, the papal court kept Rome in almost unimaginable iniquity. Within the very churches every sort of impurity was committed; for the convenience of cardinals and priests houses of evil accommodation were kept in close proximity to churches; nor was concupiscence confined to members of the opposite sex. Many bishops, cardinals and not a few popes were tainted with the filthiest of crimes. Violence and murder were common, not only in the streets, but also in the sacred buildings, documentary evidence of which appears in the sequel. From about the middle of the 4th down to the 17th century, there occasionally, *very* occasionally, lived a pope who was not a criminal debauchee. Most of them kept, in the Lateran or in other of their dwellings, women, one or more of whom gave birth to papal bastards, whose origin those prelates tried to thinly veil by calling them "nephews." All Europe was put to contribution, Italy and other countries involved in devastating wars, for the sake of endowing these ill-gotten broods with princely or ducal estates and with wealth for magnificently maintaining them. It must, however, be conceded that the student of ecclesiastical history of the 10th century is struck by what appears like a congestion of papal criminality. The reason of which is, that up to nearly the end of the 9th century, Rome and her bishops (popes) had always been more or less under the supervision—control if one will—of emperors, Gothic, Lombard and Frankish kings, who often exercised their authority when papal dissension, encroachment or vice necessitated correction by lay intervention. Such overlordship, though leaving considerable latitude for irregularities, yet confined them within certain rather wide limits, but after that

Digitized by Google

date the enfeeblement of the Eastern empire, the dissolution of Charlemagne's kingdom, the weakness and the quarrels of his descendants produced the cessation of wholesome lay control, and the papacy left to its own guidance became—but what it became cannot be described in a single sentence. At an election in 885 a Stephen V. defeated another of the same name; he died in about six years and this namesake Stephen was again unsuccessful, Formosus being chosen. He reigned till 896, when he was, as said at the time, poisoned, but whether by Stephen or by one Sergius, of whom hereafter, is uncertain. Stephen also lost the next election to one Boniface VI., whom, however, he kidnapped and strangled in rather under a year. And so he got at last the papacy out of which he had been kept so long by the party of Formosus, whom he therefore especially detested, and who, though dead, was not beyond papal vengeance. Stephen had the corpse exhumed, seated in a chair of state, dressed in pontifical robes, and assigning to it a defendant advocate, instituted a canonical prosecution. At the conclusion of this weird farce, he ordered the fingers, then the head to be cut off, and the body thrown into the Tiber. All his ordained clerics were degraded, all his decrees annulled or reversed, the papers concerning his episcopacy burnt. The advantages, however, which by so many struggles Stephen had at length secured, did not last him long; for the Romans (not too strait-laced) disgusted by his crimes and cruelties, seized him, threw him into prison and strangled him. Baronius says: "This fate was well deserved by one who had entered the Church and obtained the See like a robber." During this time there lived in Rome a beautiful, ambitious and shamelessly loose woman, Theodora. She, in the last few years of the 9th century, formed illicit intimacy with Cardinal Sergius and also with the Bishop of Bologna. By birth,

Digitized by Google

and marriage she was patrician, and exerted much influence in papal matters, nevertheless insufficient to procure for Sergius after Stephen's death the papacy. Some light or at least justifiable suspicion is thrown on papal conduct of this time by the rapid succession and extinction of popes; in the last three years of the 9th and first four of the 10th century were six, of whom one, Benedictus IV., seems to have died a natural death. His successor Leo V. was imprisoned by Christopherus and never heard of again, while that last-named one was driven away by rioters in order to make room for the frequently baulked Sergius, whose most note-worthy ecclesiastical action was that he, annulling what three of his predecessors had decreed, again condemned, styling him "no-pope," Formosus, who thus was thrice evicted and three times reinstated in honor. By this time Theodora had one son, Peter, and two daughters, only one of whom, Marozia, is of interest. She began her career very early by incest with her mother's paramour, the pope who may have been her father; it is unlikely that either of these women could assign any particular paternity to their children, and so the spawn is somewhat mixed. Be it as it may, Marozia, partly in consequence of her own, partly of her husband's patrician position, had much influence in the State, and wished also to annex the sacerdotal power. While Theodora was, as above stated, intimate with the Bishop of Bologna, she procured his promotion to the archbishopric of Ravenna, and in 914, apparently by her daughter's aid or connivance, placed this minion on the papal seat under the alias of John X. He had no ecclesiastic talents, but leading troops against Saracens, then invading parts of Italy, left government in the hands of Peter. The arrangement did not suit Marozia, who, one night in 928 when John was in Rome, sent armed men into the Vatican with orders to kill both the pope and

Digitized by Google

Peter, the one possibly her father, the other certainly her brother on the distaff side. After the murder of John, *i.e.* between 928 and 945, six popes successively filled and were eliminated from the chair, a suspicious average of two years and ten months for each. Then in 945 Agapetus II. obtained the papacy, and, either through astute caution or from other cause, was still alive nine years after. In the meanwhile Marozia had borne a son, Octavian (939), who in very early years had shewn a remarkable genius for debauchery; yet Marozia felt that if she and her husband could dominate in the Senate, while her son should under her sway rule the Church, a power almost supreme would be hers. By poisoning Agapetus room was made for the young satyr, Octavian, alias John XII., whose residence, the Lateran, at once became a vile bagnio, the women being enriched with spoils from the churches. Even these sacred buildings were the scenes of indescribable lust; decent women on pilgrimage to Rome dared not enter St. Peter's, because there the holy father had forcibly violated several. Certain political exigencies induced John to call in the aid of Otho (the Great), which under fitting conditions he afforded; yet no sooner had the pope obtained his desire than, he broke all his pledges; but he was a little over hasty, Otho having gone but a little distance, returned to Rome; John fled, and this gave to bishops and cardinals the opportunity of explaining the condition of things. The emperor wrote thus to the pope: "We have for the service of God come to Rome, and having enquired of the cardinals and bishops the cause of your absence, they related to me such shameful things as would disgrace a mountebank. All, both cleric and lay, accuse you of murders, adulteries, perjuries, incest with your relations and with two sisters; that while dicing you have invoked Jupiter, Venus and other demons, that you have drunk wine to the good health

Digitized by Google

of the Devil. We therefore request you to come instantly and reply to these accusations." The pope's answer was a threat to excommunicate all who should elect another pope. A council, nevertheless, deposed him and placed on the episcopal throne Leo VIII. The emperor sent most of his army away. John and his party failed in an attack upon him. After much fighting and bloodshed John seized an occasion of imperial absence to re-enter Rome, Leo barely escaping with his life; in this he was fortunate, for John immediately mutilated, tortured and killed those who had assented to his deposition. Continuing his accustomed mode of life, he was in 963 knocked on the head, *flagrante delicto*, by an outraged husband.

Hardly advisable is it to recount the elections, depositions and murders of popes during the hundred and nine years that elapsed between the death of John and the accession of Hildebrand; there were during that epoch thirty-two popes, while the lawlessness and crime in and around the Lateran is indescribable, almost unimaginable. Nor was such confined to popes and cardinals. Ratherius, Bishop of Verona, "a man of admirable simplicity," (born about 898), has thus described the sort of life led by archbishops and bishops in Italy: "The princely luxury in which these prelates (cardinals and bishops in Italy) live is indeed in strange contrast with the teachings of Christianity. They inhabit splendid rooms, gleaming with gold, velvet and the purple; they eat, like kings, off golden utensils; they drink their wine from costly cups or inlaid goblets. Their basilicas are dirty, but their round-bellied wine vats are gay with paintings. At meals their senses are stimulated by the aspect of beautiful dancing girls and soothed by the symphonies of skilled musicians. They slumber in the arms of their concubines on silken cushions upon artistically gilded bedsteads, while their serfs and slaves carefully see to the court arrange-

Digitized by Google

ments. They dice, shoot with the bow, and hunt. The pulpit or the altar, where they have just said mass with dagger on hip and spur at heel, is hurriedly left to mount horses, bitted with gold, saddled with morocco. In journeys they are surrounded by crowds of courtiers and clients, sit in magnificent carriages, drawn by horses such as no king would be ashamed of." But a little further on he says: "It would be very difficult to find a single one fit to be a bishop or to lay hands on a candidate for ordination."

Descending a little lower in clerical rank we take the monastery of Farsa. At the time now under consideration (936) it was very wealthy, its abbot, Roffred, had accepted a young neophyte, Campo, was most kind to him and taught him mathematics and medicine. He used this latter knowledge to poison his benefactor, and by bribing Crescentius secured the abbacy. The place then became a school of vice; the monks gathered around them a tribe of loose women, with whom they lived in villas built in the immediate vicinity of the monastery. For the payment and decoration of these women they pillaged everything they could lay hands on, even the gold seals on imperial diplomas were stolen and replaced by lead. One day at a banquet they all, the serving slaves included, got very drunk, and the building caught fire, still with some repairs it could be used; but the event calling attention to the place, such scandal arose that in 948 the monks were driven away by troops and the monastery entrusted to some others imported from Cluny.

The ignorance of almost every cleric at this period was appalling. From about the middle of the 7th century onward there were in Italy no writers of prose, history* or poetry. The Latin as there used had

* Anastasius period falls in 850 to 880; his Lib. Pont., standing as it does alone, is an invaluable record; it is, however, bad in style and arrangement.

Digitized by Google

degenerated into a corrupt dialect. The Emperor Michæl in answering a letter of Nicholas I., derided it as "writ in a language of Scyths and Savages." North of the Alps the Teutonic and Romance people, who, as less versed in the arts of luxury, were called by the Romans barbarians, were constantly producing works both in Latin and the vernacular. The Arabs, Moors and Grecians had advanced far; even southern Italy was intellectually much beyond the Romish hierarchy. Nor must it be supposed that this ignorance and depravity was confined to any particular epoch. Papists aver that their opponents always pick out for animadversion the 10th century; if that be so, it is a mistake in strategy, for there is a superabundance of equally vulnerable points in Romish armour. The earlier ones have been illustrated partly by quotations of the decree against clerical concubinage in 325, partly by quotations from contemporary historians in the 4th century, partly by the amenities and disgraceful scenes enacted by rival popes. The period from the beginning of the 11th to that of the 14th century may be rapidly reviewed; certain gaps are inevitable, not from any lack of material, but of space. In 1033 Benedict IX. won the papal election. Of him Gebehard (his contemporary who became Pope Victor II.) wrote: "To me it is horrible to say how shameful, how detestable, how dissolute was the life of Benedict IX. I shall therefore only begin my narrative at the point when God took pity on His holy Church. After he had for a long time wearied the Romans by his robberies, his murders, his abominations, the excess of his wickedness became so great that he was expelled, and John, Bishop of Sabina, was elected in his stead by bribery and contempt of the holy canons." But John was neither the only purchaser nor the only pope, there were three others; also much riot and bloodshed, and to keep decent order among clerics,

Digitized by Google

lay power was, as so often, obliged to intervene. The Emperor Henry III. entered Italy and deposed all the unseemly set. While so engaged he became acquainted with the pious abbot of Fonte Avelano, Damianus. He begged that monk to visit the pope, whom he had instituted (Clement II.) and to explain to him how the Church might yet be preserved. A letter also was sent calling papal attention to clerical delinquency. In a few years Damianus wrote again (1050) to Clement's successor (Leo IX.), sending his work entitled "Liber Gomorrhianus," showing that most clerics were addicted to the crime which gave its name to the book. Leo approved the work, and for many years candidates for high ecclesiastical rank were obliged to swear that they were innocent of those specified sins. It does not seem to have occurred to any one that persons thus guilty would hardly shrink from perjury.

When some twenty years later Gregory VII. was insisting on clerical celibacy, he did so in order to detach priests from family and civic interests, taking little account of the effect such unnatural rule must have on their morals and on those of the flock. Nevertheless, he issued a bull sharply rebuking bishops and other clerics for their "incontinentia and impudicitia." Such reproof was indeed greatly called for, as there were in Rome hundreds of priests living in concubinage or worse, their offspring, called sometimes sons, sometimes nephews, enriched with Church property, inheriting their father's benifices.* A contemporary chronicler, Bonizzo, Bishop of Catania, describes the condition of St. Peter's thus: "There were in St. Peter's sixty beadles and caretakers, laymen therefore; those men are wont to deceive strangers by dressing as cardinals and receiving offerings. At night they

* The decree of the Council of Toledo, that bastards of the clergy were slaves of the Church, was frequently evaded, indeed in Rome itself but very little adhered to.

Digitized by Google

hold orgies in the church, and the very steps of the altars are defiled by salacity, robbery and murder." Of course this could not be unknown to the priests.

Passing over a great number of similar examples, the date 1294 may be taken up when after two years' intriguing and quarrelling, Celestinus V. took the chair; he, having predilections for an ascetic, monkish life, did not carry on the papal court in the luxury the cardinals loved, and Cajetano undertook to get rid of him. Boring a hole in his sleeping chamber and inserting a tube, he shouted into it an order of immediate resignation. Celestinus, taking the mysterious voice as from Heaven, obeyed the command, and the astute cardinal became Boniface (popularly called Nero) VIII. He had, of course, bastards, to enrich whom he was profuse in murder and other crimes; more especially was he violent against the Colonnas, who also were Ghibellines, and two of which family (Cardinals) had stigmatized his election, perfectly truly, as simoniacal. These two he deposed, preached a crusade against the whole clan and laid their chief town, Preneste, level with the ground, which was sewn with salt. The members of the family, lucky enough to escape, fled; one, called Sciarra, was captured by Saracen pirates; he resolutely kept his name secret, lest his captors should sell him to the tortures of the pope; at length he escaped and took refuge with Philip-le-Bel. This monarch and the pope were quarrelling, chiefly at first on money matters. Boniface sent three angry bulls to France,* the last one of which declared that kingdom was his property, placed it under interdict and deposed the king. Philip summoned an assembly of all the French prelates and canonists

* *Clericos laicos, unam sanctam and ascolte Fili.* A sentence in the second of these runs thus: "We declare it to be necessary to salvation that every human creature should be subject to the pope." Leo XIII. in slightly extended phraseology says precisely the same.

Digitized by Google

which decreed Boniface "guilty of the worst simony, of the most detestable usury, of insulting the sacraments, of denying immortality, of declaring the lusts of the flesh the supreme good" etc., etc. and of squandering Church property to enrich a bastard, also of suborning the Saracens (the great enemies of Christianity) to seize for him a Christian country; it ended by deposing the pope, and declaring the chair vacant. Boniface, furious, was preparing some attempt against the king, who, however, forestalled him by sending Nogaret and Sciarra to Italy; they surprised him at Agnani, where they certainly insulted him and somewhat misused him; he died twenty-three days later, not apparently from any injury, but from mere rage. That all or most of the French synod's indictment was true, may be gathered from Villani's account of this "MAGNANIMUS PECCATOR"! "Boniface was cruel, ambitious, worldly-minded and sordidly avaricious, wholly intent upon accumulating riches to aggrandize his own family, heaping honors upon them, both ecclesiastic and secular (Lib. XVIII. c. 65). Baronius says: "Of all godless, shameless characters who have ever held the papal chair, Boniface was most so." In Rome his epitaph, not placed on his tomb, was: "Entravit ut vulpes regnavit ut leo, exiitis ut canis."

Such manners could not but affect the mass of the clergy, which is described as follows by Clemanges, rector of the Paris University at the end of the 14th century.* After pointing out that archbishops and bishops have to pay to Rome such huge sums for ordination etc., that they have to fleece their flocks to refill their purses, he describes some of their methods of doing so. "A cleric may be imprisoned on bread and water for some abominable crime, murder, rape or sacrilege;

* Benedict XIII. approved his work; the Leyden Faculty of Theology crowned it with its highest encomium; it "de corrupto ecclesiæ statu" is now on the Index Expurgatorius.

Digitized by Google

there he will be left until he has collected the sum that is demanded for his absolution. As soon, however, as that is paid, he comes forth white as snow and free to begin again. There is no sin, fault or crime which cannot be bought for money." He describes how farmers, when thought to have saved some money, are harassed by trumped up charges, until they have satisfied with all they can pay the proctor and the spiritual court. "And how scandalous is it, that in most dioceses the priests and curates buy with money from the bishops permission to openly keep concubines, also that those bishops erect a tariff for every crime and misdoing. But what is truly intolerable is, that no one can enter the priesthood save at heavy price, whether only sacred orders or a rank in the hierarchy; that neither the benefits of the sacrament nor the imposition of hands is conferred unless for specified sums; that every confession, absolution and dispensation is bought and sold like merchandise, indeed preferments are put up to auction by those who have their disposal, or if such are given it will only be to their bastards or to favourite play-actors. The result of such doings is that we are inundated by this immense multitude of unworthy and vile priests".... "We need not speak of their education and knowledge since we hardly ever meet with a priest who can read fluently and without absurd blunders".... "And how shall he call down the blessings of God? How indeed shall it be done by those who, through their turpitude and ignorance, have so changed their ministrations that instead of holy they are iniquitous?".... "Idle, voluptuous evil livers seek the priesthood and having obtained it, they wallow in the society of their like, spending their time in taverns, where in the filth of their drunkenness they yell and shout; their unhallowed lips insult the name of God and of the Saints. Hence these filthy

Digitized by Google

debauchees pass into the arms of their concubines from whose polluted embraces they mount to the sacred altar." He then says that many rich people buy bishoprics "for their sons while still quite young, and these soon accustom themselves to luxurious living and become so slothful or so busy in debauchery that many, even though now well advanced in years, have never been in or near their province or see, while many only visit it for pastime. But why reproach them for their absence, for probably their presence is more harmful than useful. What good can come of a visit of three or four days, which they may pay in the course of a year, and which are entirely given up to hunting, games and athletics, while their nights are spent in feasting and dancing with lewd women".... "I need say but little of chaplains and canons since I can in two words describe them as similar to their bishops, that is ignorant, simoniacal, avaricious, ambitious, jealous, negligent of their own conduct, anxious to know and blame that of others. Moreover, they are drunken and so debauched that they hesitate not to maintain openly their concubines and bastards".... "Let me now speak of monasteries and monks, the subject is ample were I not too tired already with detailing so many abominations. Nothing commendable can be said of these sons of the Church, who have vowed to renounce the world and to devote themselves to holy contemplation, to chastity, obedience and seclusion, but who are more greedy, rapacious and absorbed in temporal interests than any one else. They are also the leaders in lubricity, indiscipline and profligacy; the feverish disorder of their lives and their ardour in frequenting houses of shameful resort are unparalleled." The begging friars are, if possible, somewhat worse, in ways that cannot here be translated. The reader might look at Chaucer's "Paersons Tale." Alexander IV. in his bull of 1259 said that

Digitized by Google

"the people instead of being reformed are absolutely corrupted by their pastors.... all the evils of the Church are caused by the debauchery of the priests." In vain did many bishops try to restrain at least within decent limits priestly lubricity, such efforts could hardly succeed while other sees were, like Liege, held by such as Henry, who had in the district sixty-five bastards yet was allowed to go on for twenty-seven years.* When Innocent IV. quitted Lyons 1251, after a residence of eight years, Cardinal Hugo gave a valedictory address in which he said: "Friends, during our stay here we have done much for your city. When we came we found three or four brothels, but now on our departure we leave but one. That one, however, we must own, extends from the eastern to the western gate of the town." † This cynical boast that the clerics had debauched every woman in the place, caused much embarrassment to the many ladies present.

Clemanges, after describing priests and monks, depicts nuns: "But, however abundant the subject, mere decency does not permit me to quite display it, for in speaking of virgins consecrated to the Lord, I should have to describe all the horrors of the bagnio, all the wiles and impudence of courtezans, all the arts of w h * r * s.... For what are at this time nunneries but sanctuaries for the worship, not of God, but of Venus, and the impure receptacles of unbridled youth, abandoning itself to.... *(cannot be printed).* To place a girl in a nunnery is the same thing as sending her to a house of ill fame." The Council of Cöln (1307) censured the laxity of many convents, the nuns being permitted to leave and live a life of public immorality, until, wearied of it, they returned and were received as a matter of course. At Edinburgh, in the latter half of the 16th century, nuns walked openly about the streets with their para-

* Gregory X. deposed him 1271, on account of horrible crimes.
† Matthew Paris: Chronic. Mag. Luard's Trans. Vol. V. p. 237.

Digitized by Google

mours and their avowed bastards. St. Theresa in her efforts to reform convents, describes their condition in language only a little more veiled than Clemanges'. The few words that Clemanges says about the ignorance of priests are important. Up to the end of the 17th century all business was conducted in Latin, to use the vernacular in religious services was strictly forbidden. Yet in nearly every country the officiating priests (they were called mass-priests) could with difficulty read their books of devotion, and hardly any had the slightest idea of what the sentences meant, they knew not the merest outline of the faith they were supposed to teach. In 1551 Bishop Hooper of Gloucester had in his diocese three hundred and eleven clerics. Of these, one hundred and sixty-eight were unable to read the decalogue, and of these, thirty-two did not know where in the Scriptures to find it, forty could not tell where the Lord's prayer was writ, and of these, thirty did not know who was its author.

It will be necessary to refer again to sacerdotal ignorance and crime, for it is unfortunately hardly possible to speak of a priest without becoming involved in one or other of those subjects; meanwhile this chapter may appropriately close with a quotation: "Little children! let no man deceive you: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as He is righteous: he that doeth evil is of the devil. (1 John III. 7.)

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER IV

WEALTH

Ye have made it a den of thieves.

AT p. 36 of the preceding chapter mention was made of the successful gift and legacy hunting of Romish bishops, deacons etc., and of the laws found necessary to check the ardour of their pursuit. The disapproval which such conduct may occasion will probably be mitigated by considering the state of Roman society from the latter years of the republic onward, when all ranks were thoroughly corrupt, the patricians and wealthy by indulgence in sensuality, the plebs by even coarser gratification and by the vile employ of ministering to the vices of their superiors. These and a middle class, chiefly freed men small in influence, were kept quiet by the games and combats of the circus and by other display; even worship of the gods was a spectacular pleasure, both in the temples and the streets; the gilded and jewelled walls of the one, the adorned buildings of the other were enlivened by processions with music and dancing, grotesque images and much license. As long as these histrionic pageants, together with sufficient food, were provided, no people could be more easily governed; if these were lacking, none could be more unruly. When, in the course of events, the rule of patricians was shared, then overshadowed, and afterwards appropriated by bishops, these had to deal with that popular temper. Up to and even beyond 400, many of the Senate and a large number of the people, being still pagan, dreaded

Digitized by Google

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the effect on the fortunes of the town, should the gods be angered by discontinuance of processions in the streets and round the fields teeming with coming crops. Also those, led rather by the trend of the time than by conviction, who had recently been converted were not averse to seeing the glitter of their old transferred to the new cult, and thus very soon after Christianity was favoured by Constantine, it took over from paganry much ostention in the services, as St. Jerome about 370 describes. "The marble walls shine, the ceilings glitter with gold, the altars with precious stones, although the true servants of Christ are not thus resplendent." The priest officiating amid such, if dressed in the simple garb of the early converts, would make an incongruous figure; the humble clothing of disciples of the lowly One became robes and vestments, which, to harmonize with the surrounding splendour, must needs glitter with gems and costliness; also, that the action might correspond with scenic surroundings, the services no longer "continued steadfast in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship and in breaking of bread and in prayers" (Acts II. 42), but was so overlaid with complications, borrowed for the most part, like incense and lustral water, from precedent temple worship, that St. Augustine even at a very early date (590) complained that the "burden of the Christian service had become more intolerable than of the Jewish." But these changes answered their purpose of attracting many of the wealthy, and to attend worship became for the cream of a pleasure-loving patriciate "a function of fashionable society." The following picture by St. Jerome is evidently drawn from his own observation. "Should the matron desire to perform an act of public worship, she (and one sees it is the same patriciate disguised in Christianity) is carried, like Sabinus or Ruburrus, her cousins, in a magnificent litter, preceded by crowds of eunuchs, to

Digitized by Google

the basilica of St. Peter, where she distributes alms with her own hand, that she may seem more pious; also, when she holds her agapeti, they are announced by a herald." This demonstrates that since the primitive era the leaders of the new religion had greatly changed; they were no longer teachers of an unselfish, humble faith, but had become the pets—"the lions of the smart set." To attain and then to keep this position much money was needed, and Romish bishops scrupled not as to how it was obtained. For an early instance Socrates Scholasticus may be cited (440). "Cælestinus, Bishop of Rome (422—30), took away the churches of the Novatians at Rome also, and obliged Rusticola, their bishop, to hold their meetings secretly in private houses. Until this time that sect had flourished exceedingly in the imperial city of the West, possessing many churches there. But envy attacked them also, as soon as the Romish episcopate, like that of Alexandria, extended itself beyond the limits of ecclesiastical jurisdiction,* for thenceforth the Romish bishops would not suffer even those who perfectly agreed with them on matters of faith and the purity of whose doctrines they extolled, to enjoy the liberty of assembling in peace, but stripped them of all they possessed." (Lib. VII. c. 11.) Many like spoliations were, according to the same author, perpetrated. Nevertheless, it is probable that the money thus obtained formed but a small fraction of papal income, for it is characteristic of Rome that, however vast may be her resources, she never neglects smaller pickings such as the sale of venal masses, trade in slaves, even the farming out of wax chandlers' business.† Rightful interest on loans was under the name of usury forbidden, but a great many popes and other high clerics lent at exorbitant rates, and as

* The meaning of this is made plain in Chap. V.

† Previously to 1870, and probably even now, every Romish church had close to it a candle-shop, license to keep which was purchased of the priest.

Digitized by Google

the money was usually wanted to buy a living of that very ecclesiastic, he kept the capital in his pocket while enjoying the interest. There were other means; the reader may be reminded that the laity were and are sedulously taught that the Divine mercy can only be obtained through the intervention of a priest, (Indulgentia Dei nisi supplicationibus sacerdotum nequeat obtinere) therefore one too superstitious to note the artifice, thinking that his eternal weal depends upon the goodwill of his particular cleric, will pay any demanded price to secure it; when dying he will make any testamentary disposition exacted in order to procure what he is told are the only efficacious prayers. To this must be added fees, frequently large, for the viaticum, for the astutely imposed extreme unction, masses to alleviate the pains, or to get relatives' souls out of that profitably invented place called purgatory. None of these performances, save for the utterly destitute, are done gratuitously. Any doubt as to the salesman's ability to supply what he receives cash for, is set aside by the decree, "So great is the power of the priest that the judgments of Heaven are subject to his decision." Thus did many a fine domain, many a broad acre pass into sacerdotal possession; almost entirely inefficacious against this absorptive capacity were the statutes of premunire and of mortmain.

From a very early period all accessible parts of Europe were laid under contribution. In the first half of the 8th century the West Saxon King Ito permitted the imposition of Peter's pence;* this was not a voluntary donation, but a tax on every hearth. In 850 Athelwulf consented to pay in addition, annually and in perpetuity, 300 gold marks. Innocent III. in 1213 extorted from John, as price for annulling the interdict, 1000 gold marks annual payment, besides

* A very moderate computation makes this amount to £10,000 annually in modern value.

Digitized by Google

forcing him to yield his kingdom to the Romish see, and to swear fealty to him (Innocent), and then to receive it back as a mere fiefdom of the pope. Lucius, a little earlier (1143), ordered Henry II. to send him money for combating his justly incensed subjects in Rome. Honorius III. demanded one-tenth, not of the income, but of the mobilia of nobles, clergy and landed gentry. The same pope ordered that two prebendaries in every cathedral and conventual church must belong to the Romish see in perpetuity. Indeed it was a pleasantly economical device of popes to provide for their bastards or other relatives, as also to pay for services, more or less unavowable, with a fat English preferment; the persons so benefited very seldom came near the place. In 1240 Cælestinus sent into England Peter Lerouge, demanding under pain of interdict, as "gifts" from bishops and abbots, jewels, horses, trappings etc.; also a very few years later a certain Martin was charged with similar extortion (Matthew Paris). Dispensations, divorces, permission to commit perjury, to marry within prohibited degrees, absolution for some committed evil, all these were heavily paid for. (Aliter non absolvebantur nisi tribuerent secundum posse suum. Cnithon, Chronicon.) Also sold were preferments, and licenses for clerics to hold as many as he could buy, likewise to keep as many concubines as he could support; the money paid for this indulgence was called the "cullagium." The frequent Turk-tax, of which the pope was receiver and spent very little coin on the expeditions, commuting it into blessings, masses and other such as cost him, or rather the subscribed fund, nothing. England paid these taxes to a larger amount than any other kingdom (Lord Herbert of Cherbury). No pope has ever been induced to show the accounts of a Turk-tax. The frequent, sudden demands were very profitable and convenient to popes, their amount is not calculable. It does not seem that the annual

Digitized by Google

imposts were ever abrogated, and must therefore be added to the sums (p. 64) for the pallium, for reservations, annates, ordinations; and so in Henry VII.'s time the money got from this country alone was enormous. Space will not permit enumeration of such sources of income as the sale of blessed beads, Mary's or St. Catherine's girdle, iron filings, chips of wood, scapularies and so on, nor indeed certain exactions, some of which may be charitably described as mere astuteness, though most will not bear so lenient a description. This last phrase may very possibly be considered scandal or even "Protestant calumny;" it shall be supported by contemporary opinion of Romish prelates. Gebehard, before he became Pope Victor II. (1216—27), wrote: "Love of gold has at all times been the scandal and opprobrium of the sacred chair; he who can give neither money nor presents will get nothing from Rome." Baptist Prior of the Carmelite monastery at Mantua says: "Everything is sold in Rome—temples, priesthood, altars, sacraments, incense, prayers, Heaven, even God Himself,"—and Alvarez Pelagio: "No one can get an audience of the pope without paying at the door; poor folk can never obtain one, because they have nothing to give. How will my lords the cardinals answer this? they who always have their hands ready and never say: Enough. Now-a-days prelates are not pastors seeking to gain souls, but mercenaries only demanding gold. The holy mysteries must be paid for, they sell the body of Jesus Christ. For nothing they give nothing; but they do not sell Grace. One cannot trade in what one does not possess." Also Pelagio, grand penitentiary to John XXIII., an ardent fautor of papal autocracy, laments, through pages of his "De Planctu Ecclesiæ," the insatiable greed of the Romish Church. He "never entered the apostolic chamber without seeing clerics counting and weighing

Digitized by Google

money that lay in heaps before them".... Of the Romish bishop he says: "His magnificence was such that though the revenue was greater than that of any king it did not suffice; therefore these greedy shepherds made incursions into other folds rich in fleeces and in milk." Two letters from the envoy of the Teutonic order of knighthood at the papal court, to the Superior in Germany (1420—1423 respectively): "Dear Grandmaster, you must send more money, for here at the court all friendship ends with the last penny;" the latter: "Greed reigns supreme at the papal court: it is impossible to describe all the devices used at Rome to get money. Day by day new tricks are invented for extorting money from Germany, under the pretext of ecclesiastical fees. Hence much outcry and complaining among scholars and courtiers, also much questioning in regard to the papacy is arising. Possibly obedience will by-and-bye be entirely renounced to escape from these outrageous exactions; this course would I perceive be acceptable in many countries." Æneas Sylvius (Pius II. 1458—64): "The court of Rome permits everything for money; it sells the Holy Ghost, sacred ordinations and sacraments; it forgives sins of every sort to the criminal who pays; keep your money to buy a less vain thing than indulgence." Claude d'Espence, a highly placed cleric of the Sorbonne, was accredited to Trent, where he said of the Romish Church: "The sins of men are her golden harvest, as the chancellor himself declares, the evidence of which is her superabundant wealth, not to be refuted or disproved by argument,.... when money is the object everything is permitted, there is no crime for which one cannot buy a dispensation at Rome. As soon as the money is paid into the chest, the sin is forgiven, the only unpardonable offence is to be poor. Infamous is it that for a yearly payment priests are allowed to keep concubines

Digitized by Google

with whom they live and by whom they have children." Macchiavelli wrote: "We Italians have became irreligious and wicked and for that our thanks are due to the Church and the priests." A little later this state of things had reached such a height that even a pope, Paul III. (1534—49), saw that some change must be made; he appointed eight cardinals, among them Caraffa, Pole and Sadolet, as a committee *de emendanda ecclesia;* the following are extracts of their report: "In ordinations no trouble or care is taken to choose proper men, that persons extremely ignorant, ill-bred and befouled by immorality are commonly ordained." Most priests "are monsters who, by many ways, especially by giving money to the datary or penitentiary, free themselves from the control of the ordinary".... "Another abuse is the collation of livings, especially with the cure of souls; and, above all, of bishoprics, the manner being that good provision is made for him who holds the benefice, but for the flock of Christ none at all.... The higher clergy cheat by simony as to benefices and bishoprics without regard to anything but gain.... Cardinals are to assist the pope, if these be at the same time bishops, they must neglect their sees—and how can the holy see guide others and correct abuses if she suffer such in her principal members.... Another abuse is that benefices are sold in reversion.... by which means when a vacancy occurs those that deserve best are excluded.... If any republic or kingdom permitted such abuses, it would in a little while fall headlong to ruin and would not by any means be able to subsist long; and yet we think it is lawful for us" (high clerics) "in the Romish Church, so that we have the doing of it ourselves, to see these monsters brought into the commonwealth of Christendom." * "At this time the papacy

* Caraffa, one of the eight signing this report, became Pope Paul IV. in 1549, and almost immediately placed his own work on the Index.

Digitized by Google

was drawing immense sums from all Europe and, as a commensurate return, was flooding every land with "extremely ignorant, ill-bred, immoral monsters," to whom it had sold, "without regard to anything but gain," benefices and bishoprics, while intruding into alien sees, chiefly into English ones, Italian priests, who, to the moral advantage of the inhabitants, very rarely went to the places allotted them. Some idea of the actual hard cash thus paid may be gathered. The papal taxes in 1552 on the abbeys and churches in France paid annually 690,750 francs. Francis I. replied to an enquiry of Charles V.: "I have already paid 120,000 fr. and must shortly pay 80,000 fr. more (this in addition to the preceding). From Germany very much more must have been extracted.

Concerning England, Godwin, bishop of Rochester, and Lord Herbert of Cherbury (statesman and historian) afford information. The list of the former is as follows, though one or two sees are omitted:

Canterbury	£ 2,220
Pallium	„ 1,125
Ely	„ 2,800
Coventry and Lichfield	„ 680
Norwich	„ 2,000
Worcester	„ 450
Hereford	„ 450
Chichester	„ 79
St. Davids	„ 337
Llandaff	„ 157
London	„ 657
Winchester	„ 2,800
Salisbury	„ 1,125
Bath and Wells	„ 172
Bangor	„ 28
St. Asaph	„ 28
York	„ 4,000
Pallium	„ 2,000
Durham	„ 2,025
Carlisle	„ 225
Total squeezed from 18 bishoprics	£ 25,388

of forbidden books; a few other findings of this Consilium are given in Chap. V.

Digitized by Google

The latter wrote in 1532: "The preamble and consideration of an act then passed showed that great sums of money had already passed out of the kingdom, being no less £160,000 since the second year of Henry VII. (1487)." "In 1535 investigation showed that 70,000 gold marks went from England usually (*i. e.* misprint for annually) to Rome." *

Thus there were every year many thousand golden reasons why popes should be much annoyed at England's repudiation of them, for no one with a grain of common sense, considering the sort of clerics they appointed, can suppose that zeal for religion had anything to do with their wrath. But we will pass to more recent times and to another land. The peasants and cultivators of Austro-Hungary are by no means well off, the wealth of the Church is enormous. An extremely well-informed writer (Contemp. Review, V. LXII. 469), gave the following: The more than princely grandeur of the Bishop of Diakovar has caused the destruction of forests valued at 18,000,000 fl. (£1,375,000). The Cardinal Archbishop of Olmütz made a yearly gift to the pope of 100,000 fr. (£4000) and he died in possession of 50,000,000 fr. (£2,000,000). The present Archbishop of Gran has an annual income of 800,000 fr. (£67,000), the Bishop of Kolossa 600,000 fr. (£54,000) and so on.

But these pickings sink into insignificance when compared to the profits on indulgences,† the inception of which was the purposeful mistranslation of the Greek Gospel word "metanoieo" into "do penance" instead of "repent," mentioned again hereafter. Penance means in Romish diction, infliction on himself or, more

* Money was in the time of Henry VII. and VIII. worth respectively fifteen and twelve times its present value.

† The word is a law-term of pagan Rome. On certain festivals the emperor released some law-breakers; these mitigations of punishment were named in the civil code, indulgences. Caracalla roused the indignation of the Senate by selling them.

Digitized by Google

usually, imposition by a priest of some punishment for committed sin, and this, though at first a humiliation before the congregation, soon became converted into the defrayment of certain expenses and so into the exaction of a money-fine. In 1410 Baldassare Cossa was elected pope; his original occupation—piracy—had accustomed him to spoliation, and perceiving that canonical penance brought him little or nothing, he hit on the ingenious idea of comprising a list of prices (taxæ cancellariæ) for sins already or about to be committed. This price-current, not then made public, was used by sacerdotal commercial agents as a reference table when some person who was contemplating, or had perpetrated, any such transgression as murder, robbery etc., inquired how much money forgiveness in Heaven would cost; just as now-a-days a housekeeper asks of a chandler the price of butter or pork. The theory of such transactions is this: Christ says to His apostles and disciples, "When ye have done all the things that are commanded you say, We are unprofitable servants." The Romish Church, as in so much else, contradicts the Saviour, and asserts that very many people were much more virtuous than God meant them to be, thereby producing a "superfluity of merits." The Almighty sets, says Rome, the plus of this goodness against the minus of other folks' evil and hands the credit balance, under the name of "treasury of merits," to the Romish Church, that it may sell retail, for very large amounts in the aggregate, a supply of assorted sins, according to demand, and their forgiveness. As, however, the stock-in-trade costs the pope nothing, the percental profit defies calculation. The price-list which John XXIII. compiled was, as already said, not published at that time; but in 1513 the spendthrift Leo X. advertised a great sale of indulgences at reduced prices, and published the tariff under the name "Taxæ Sacræ Cancellariæ." Although the authen-

Digitized by Google

ticity of this book, even its very existence, has by papists been denied, the proofs are too strong. Many editions of various dates are extant, the Paris one of 1520 being the most accessible; and still existing is the papal permission to Toussaint, a publisher, to print this particular edition, and the grant of a monopoly in its sale for three years. Escobar, a Jesuit casuist, quotes directly from it. D'Espence, a name mentioned awhile ago, said: "Printed here in Paris is a book entitled 'Taxes of the Sacred Chancery,' out of which more evil and enormities may be learned than out of the most infamous publications. For certain sums of money all crimes are permitted; Rome sells her absolution for every sin and for the most monstrous misdeeds, I dare not even mention their names. Is Rome shameless?" Conrad, Archbishop of Usberg, apostrophized the curia thus: "Rejoice, oh Vatican! All the riches of the world are open to thee; thou may'st seize upon them as thou wilt. Delight thee in the sins of the children of men, for there thou findest thy profit; thy wealth is built upon their transgressions and crimes. Sow among them discord, for it will bring thee piles of gold. Rejoice, sing pæans of joy, for all mankind submit to thy rules. Neither religion nor piety, but shameful desires and depravity have brought rich profit to thy net. All men are subservient to thee, knowing that so they may commit every crime and get absolution for a little gold. If only they give thee money thou openest to them the gates of Heaven. What do I say? Verily for a little gold thou sellest to them the very Christ." Thus for papists to repudiate the book as a fabrication by protestants in order to discredit the papacy, is too futile; no one could have suborned these prelates to quote and criticize the compilation. "The catholic doctrine of indulgence" has of late been written about a good deal by papist priests, but they do not even agree

Digitized by Google

among themselves; *e.g.*, Maimbourg says indulgence remits the sin as well as the penalty; Lingard that it remits the latter only. The Romish Bishop Hedley wrote: "When grievous sin is forgiven, the soul from guilty becomes innocent, from black becoming white; as a consequence, when the soul is thus no longer guilty, it is free from the doom of everlasting punishment. This seems clear enough. But the catholic view is that even after the guilty stain has been taken away and the dread sentence is no longer to be feared, *some punishment* may still remain." To put it a little clearer, the catholic view is that the Just and Merciful God plunges the white innocent soul into hottest fires for an indefinite time, unless previous to its release from the body the individual have made over certain monies to the Romish Church. In this price-list of sins are some that d'Espence feared to name, which of course cannot be mentioned here, yet some items from the bill of fare "à la carte" offered by the Romish Church to gourmets in crime may be quoted. The list consists of thirty-two headings, each with from three to twenty-four specified and priced sins. Murder may be committed for 27 l. 15 s. The assassin if he buy absolution for 45 l. 19 s., may take orders; but if he want a bull forbidding civil prosecution, he must pay 75 l. 19 s. 6 c. The priest who has committed a murder and wishes to hold three preferments, must pay 75 l. 10 s. If he desire to hold more than three and to live in peace (*i.e.* guaranteed against lay jurisdiction), he must pay 87 l. 3 s." After exhausting the subject of murders already committed and their tariff, Caput XIX. continues thus: "Provisional absolution for a murder that may in the future be probable (pray let the reader mark this), 76 l. 6 s., and to be free of all prosecution on its account 131 l. 19 s. 6 c." The following item aids in accounting for the state of convents which Sta. Theresa and very many

Digitized by Google

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

others so deeply lamented. "A nun who has lived unchastely with several men, and wishes to be rehabilitated and capable of taking the dignities of her order, even that of abbess, must pay for absolution and reinstatement 139 l." In all this price-list amendment or repentance are not mentioned, the one reiterated note is Pay! It is, however, preceded by a short preface which ought to be quoted. "But note carefully that these methods of pardon and dispensation are not granted to the poor, because they cannot and are not to be thus consoled." (Et nota diligenter quod hujusmodi gratiæ et dispensationis non concediantur pauperibus quia non sunt ideo non possunt consolari.)

All or nearly all Romish writers acknowledge that "grievous scandals arose in connection with the promulgation and proclamation of indulgences," but they take care to so word the admission that the scandal seems to apply only to subordinate agents; far from that being the case, the obloquy, as the utterances of prelates above quoted show, lies at the door of the Vatican and the gates of St. Peter's.

We need not, however, cease examination into this subject of condoning sins for a certain money payment at the 16th century. In and about the year 1860 the kingdom of Naples, including Sicily, was very unquiet, and in the island robbery with or without murder was common, and so profitable that the pope, Pius IX., thought he might as well have a share in the plunder. He therefore promulgated through the Archbishop of Palermo the "bull of Composition," which was affixed to the cathedral and church doors in and about the city, and which made provision that those who, being wanted by the police, might otherwise find difficulty, could transmit the quota demanded without coming into collision with the constituted authorities. It decrees that those who pay

Digitized by Google

into the papal coffers 2 tari, 12 grana and 3 piccoli shall be free and pardoned, *in foro conscientiæ tantum*,* for all the rest due to gentlemen not certainly known whom they may have robbed and murdered, "or if he pay 76 tari and 4 grana, it will not be necessary to make any other restitution, the rest may be kept and possessed with a quiet mind as though it had been honestly acquired." After the preamble there follows a list of nineteen crimes, and then comes what may be taken as an affirmative answer to d'Espence's question "Is Rome shameless?" "16 Di piu tutte le femmine che non sono pubblicamente desonestesi possono comporre di qualsivoglia prezzo di danaro o di gemme che per ragione turpe avessero ricevuto; e gli uomini che similamente per la suddeta ragione avessero ricevuto danaro o altro da femmine libre, si possono comporre della stessa maniere." However, this particular partnership, the description of which has been left in its original language, seems, on account of the limitation introduced, to have been insufficiently lucrative, therefore in an emended form "who are not publicly immoral" was omitted, so that the pope might share also in the gains of those that were so. It should be noted that in this bull, as in the chancery taxes, all mention of amendment, since such would tend to diminish the source of papal profit, is very carefully avoided. Of course by papists the existence of this document has been denied and ascribed to "protestant calumny," but it was denounced by both Signor Maggiorani and General Cadorna, and about four years after papal temporal power had ceased, it formed the subject of debate in the Italian parliament.

Lastly, in regard to indulgence on which this bull of partnership in the profits of vice is founded, some notice must be taken of certain assertions made early

* This clause means that Pius could not guard them against secular action.

Digitized by Google

last year by Cardinal Vaughan. In pointing out an error in the translation of a bull of indulgence granted to Herr Joseph Mayer, who takes the principle part in the Oberammergau passion-drama, that prelate professes to be astonished at the shocking ignorance which can suppose that a pope would grant an indulgence for future sins; he says: "The thing is simply impossible" ("Nineteenth Century and After," January 1901). In the same number Mr. Lang (apparently of Oberammergau) wrote: "A pardon for sin to be committed is simply inconceivable." Now Leo XIII. gave to Herr Mayer a plenary absolution *in articulo mortis*, for himself and for his relations by consanguinity and affinity to the third degree inclusive. Of course in what follows no aspersion whatever is cast on Herr Mayer and his relatives, but it is clear that when this bull was issued several in the third or in nearer degrees of consanguinity were not yet born, were babes, or at all events not too senile to commit sin; therefore, if any of them (no such accusation is made) chose to lead evil lives, they might do so light-heartedly, for if this plenary absolution means anything at all, it purports to give at the moment of death pardon for sins that had not been committed at the date (4th July, 1890,) when the bull was issued. Moreover, a thing that has been done is neither impossible nor inconceivable, and the 19th Clause of the Taxæ Cancellariæ runs: "Provisional absolution for a murder that may in the future be probable 76 livres, 6 sous." Hence it is evident that for nearly three hundred years concession of indulgence for sin to be in the future committed, has been practised in the Romish Church, and that Cardinal Vaughan ignores this clause. If so, not much can be said for his candour; or he possibly is not aware of it, in which case he is not in a position to tax other people with "shocking ignorance."

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER V

AGGRESSION

My kingdom is not of this world.

THE earliest constitution of Christian communities was one of perfect equality among the members, save only that the apostles having had more than all others, direct teaching from and communion with the Master, were regarded with especial reverence. The believers in each locality arranged the internal and external management of the community, and of course for different branches of affairs officers were appointed; they were the hands and mouthpieces of the fraternity. Among these officials were such as, distinguished by their greater knowledge, were chosen to teach the lessons of Holy Writ, and to these would naturally fall the arrangement of the very simple rites and the guidance in this or the other direction of belief; they were called in different places, elders, (presbyters), overseers (episcopi), or patriarchs; their position gave them much influence, but no governance over the faithful, who under the name of flock were the aim, the object of the Christian revelation and institution; the officers under whichever of the above names being but the wheels of the mechanism set up in order to convert the world to the worship of True Divinity.

But, unfortunately, within two and a half centuries and in the chief centres of the new religion, these officials,

Digitized by Google

cherishing more ambitious ideas, began to look upon the flock as a multitude, not to be guided and led, but to be rigorously even sternly governed, and thus arose a sharp distinction between priest and people, analogous to what was prevalent among the heathen, but was by Christ forbidden (Mark and Luke). About this time appeared certain documents "adorned with the name" of Ignatius (Bishop of Antioch and Martyr,) upon which the sacerdotal polity of the Romish Church, was chiefly founded. They consisted of seven epistles, four of which, and most markedly that one to the Magnesians, described the Church as a bishop, a college of presbyters and a few deacons; the flock for whose behoof was the Christian revelation, is hardly mentioned at all save as a herd owing unquestioning obedience to that one man and his subordinates. Even as early as Eusebius' time, some discredit was thrown on certain of these letters, the historian pointing out that the second was spurious, nor could he cite any authority supporting more than three (two to Romans, one to Polycarp). About fifty years ago, these particular three letters were found by Tattam in a Syrian monastery, they are indeed the only genuine letters of Ignatius. The other four are forgeries, and the three discovered ones show that the versions of these circulated and used by the Romish see, have been interpolated and altered in ways that made them very useful for the establishment of a dominant hierarchy. Even as early as the second half of the third century the violence of disputatious controversy led many men to flood the Christian community with fabrications and interpolations that supported their own views or aspirations. This unhappy tendency is referred to elsewhere.

The first three Gospels report Christ's command to "render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," St. Paul exhorted the Romans (XIII. 1—7) to obey

Digitized by Google

the powers that be; Tertullian and other pristine fathers wrote in like vein. Thus the communities, besides the link of a common religion, were bound together by the duty of obedience to the same monarch. When Constantine issued (311) the Edict of Milan, he retained for himself supremacy over all Christendom. In that capacity he summoned and presided over the Council of Nicæa, the 4th and 5th canons of which forbid ascendency of any one bishop, thus: "IV. The chief bishop of any one province shall be consecrated by all the bishops thereof (should it consist with their convenience to meet), at least three being present, the rest consenting; but the confirmation of their acts is in every province reserved to the metropolitan thereof. V. A cleric, condemned in one province, shall not be received and re-instated if he flee to another." Should in any province difficulties otherwise insoluble arise, the bishop of that province had power to call a council, the presidency of which devolved upon himself. But he of Rome, finding himself at the head of what so short a time before was the Queen City of the world, cherished the idea that he who ruled at Rome should govern the universe; thus, not long after the great council and continuously since, such has been the aim of Romish policy. The first post-Nicene effort was made by Julius I. (336—352), who wrote to an assembly of Easterns, reproving them for having called a meeting at Antioch, which they, so he said, had no right to do unless by his permission, since to the Romish Church alone belonged the supervision over all other Churches (Plat. sub Jul). They laughed and replied that Christianity was born in the East, that the Church, where they then were, was older than that of Rome; if, therefore, a question of superiority arose, such belonged to the Oriental elder and not to the Western younger branch. Theodosius in 381—2

Digitized by Google

chose from a list furnished to him, Nectarius to be Patriarch of Constantinople, and the Italian bishops wrote that they should have been asked to a conference. "We do not claim a prerogative of selection, but in making choice all should have been consulted." Very soon after this Damasus made a more decided bid for supremacy by writing to the Bishop of Mauritania, that all important causes, *i.e.* dissensions, must be settled by him; the answer was to refer him to the Nicene decrees. These canons, therefore, were very distasteful to Rome, and a characteristic method was adopted in 417, when those who were annoyed at these repeated attempts, called a synod at Carthage, to which Zosimus sent an Italian prelate (Faustinus) with what purported to be a copy of the Nicene decrees; but the patriarch had brought with him to the meeting his transcript of the original document, and the two hundred and sixty-seven assembled prelates found that to the Romish copy two "commonitoria" had been added. Certain members of the synod were then sent to Alexandria, Antioch and Constantinople to examine the copies there, Zosimus being informed that he also might send a delegate. In no one of the documents were those commonitoria found; they only appeared in that one which had been through the Romish factory. From this time down to the present moment no Romish document can be accepted unless after full examination. (See Chap. XVI.)

In 588 John, Patriarch of Constantinople, took the title of "Universal Bishop." Gregory I. (the Great) was horrified and condemned the apellation in twelve letters addressed to John, to the Emperor Maurice, the empress and several eastern bishops. "To name oneself Œcumenical Bishop is to call oneself the only bishop and to encroach on the rights of all others. This haughty designation is a blasphemy and an insult to the Gospels, to the canons of councils and

Digitized by Google

to the decrees of the Fathers. One who assumes such title brings grave injury on the Church; he is the precursor of Anti-Christ, the embodiment of Lucifer." When John died Cyriacus succeeded him and assumed the same title, and again did Gregory remonstrate in similar terms and reproved him. In 602 Phocas murdered the Emperor Maurice and all his children. When a few months afterwards Boniface III. became Bishop of Rome, he sent to the usurper felicitations and recognition of him as rightful emperor, thus purchasing the anti-Christian title of Œcumenical Bishop, which therefore is a tenet derived not from Christian or Scriptural teaching, but from the assent of a ruthless murderer.

By the end of the 8th century the Romish Church had but little influence outside a somewhat restricted part of Italy, to acquire more a number of documents were fabricated, purporting to emanate from the reputed Isidor of Seville. Among these are letters, decrees etc. "adorned with the names" of some very early popes; they describe a condition of society and a regulation of ecclesiastical government impossible at the date pretended. Several learned men, including Hincmar (Rheims), exposing their falsity, incurred the rancour of the pope. Much later (17th century) Cardinal Fleury described them thus: "Those of Isidor are long, full of commonplace, and all in the same style, which is much more of the VIII. than of earlier epochs of Christianity. The dates referred to are nearly all wrong and the contents of these letters betray their falsity, they speak of archbishops, bishops and patriarchs as though these titles had existed in the infancy of the Church; they forbid holding of councils, even provincial ones, without permission of the pope, and represent as of ordinary occurrence appeals to Rome." He might have truthfully added that in these letters events are often mentioned which did not occur till years after

Digitized by Google

the fictive writer's death, and that the matters descanted on are such as interested the Church when the fabrications took place, but were not broached at the pretended period. The cardinal's last quoted phrase clearly shows the aim and object of the forgeries. The particular fabrication to which attention must now be drawn is an alleged will of Constantine; it did not make its appearance till 854, though it may have been conceived earlier; had it really existed at or near the time of that emperor's death, Romish bishops could not possibly have permitted it during many struggles with subsequent emperors and with other branches of Christendom to remain inoperative for five hundred and twenty years. Moreover, Eusebius' contemporary life of Constantine shows that he took less interest in the Romish branch and in its bishop than he did in Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria and, through Hosius of Cordova, in Spain.*

These are some of the provisions of the will, on the very face of them absurd.

1. Constantine in order to raise the chair of St. Peter above the empire and its worldly status bequeaths to it by this donation all imperial powers and dignities.
2. It shall have supremacy over the patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem and all other Churches in the world.
3. It shall be the judge of all things pertaining to Divine Service and Christian doctrine.
4. Instead of the diadem which the emperor wished to place on the pope's, Sylvester's, head, (but he would not receive it) Constantine demises to him the *phrygium* (tiara) and the imperial neck-orna-

* The myth that the emperor was severely afflicted with leprosy until miraculously cured by Sylvester of Rome, is utterly void of foundation.

Digitized by Google

ment (lorum) and all other imperial insignia, colours and garments.

5. The Romish clergy shall hold and possess the high privileges of the imperial Senate, so that they shall support and be invested with the patrician and consular most exalted ornaments and insignia which the *optimati* have been wont to use.
6. The offices of *cubicalarii*, *ostiarii* and *excubiti* shall be continued in the papal palace and court.*
7. The Romish clergy are to ride on horses decked with white trappings, and like senators to wear white slippers.
8. If a member of the Senate shall, the pope permitting him, wish to become an ecclesiastic, none shall prevent him.
9. Constantine bequeaths the exclusive government of Rome, provinces, towns and burghs of all Italy or of the western territories, to Pope Sylvester and his successors.

These imperial insignia and prerogatives are fabled to be devised to Romish bishops, when Constantine was actually bequeathing his empire with its emblems of royalty and authority to his sons; yet the forgery pretends that he designed to raise the bishop above those princes, and this conduct is ascribed to a ruler who at Nicæa had decreed that no bishop had any power beyond the limits of his own diocese. Although perfectly aware that they were forged, popes chose to uphold these absurdities; more than one man has been burnt alive for doubting their authenticity. On them in part is founded the large papal claim to domination.

A few words about imperial ascendency over the papacy must be said. The law concerning papal

* These were functionaries of the imperial court when in state, which no subject was permitted to maintain.

Digitized by Google

elections (6th century) was that the emperor could, at his pleasure, ratify or annul the choice. *Nihil e clero inelegando pontifice, tum actum erat nisi imperator approbasset,* and during the periods when barbarian occupation of Italy rendered Rome inaccessible from Constantinople, control of papal elections devolved on the Patriarch of Ravenna. At the end of the 8th century Charlemagne, by edict, left the elections to the free choice of clergy and people, strictly, however, on condition that it must be ratified by imperial assent. Paschal I. wrote (817), humbly to Louis le Debonnaire begging forgiveness that he had been enthroned without the prince's assent, alleging troublous times. "*Gregory IV., in 827, was not consecrated until the emperor's ambassador had come to Rome and examined of what sort the choice might be.*" * On the death of Benedict III. (858) the Emperor Ludwig II. noting an attempt to evade imperial assent, went to Rome and directed the clergy and people to choose Nicholas I. A few years later, the disruption of Charlemagne's empire and its division among incompetent descendants, opened up to the popes opportunities whereof they took every advantage, firstly to shake off imperial ascendency and then to establish their own above that of the emperor. This relaxation of wholesome lay control resulted within thirty years in those hideous orgies of papal crime described in Chapter III. The last thirty years of the tenth century are marked by no special event, save occupation of the chair by Gerbert (Sylvester II.), who possessed a love of study and, according to the standard of the time, considerable learning; neither did the first thirty years of the 11th century produce any event worthy of record, till Benedict IX. was

* Di Marca de Concord Sacerd. et Imperii. The *italics* are the historian's.

Digitized by Google

elected (see Chap. III.), when again the laity had to preserve at least a show of decency among the clergy—the sheep were obliged to superintend and correct the shepherd—all these unseemly doings, have already been briefly described.

During the next two reigns (Nicholas II. and Alexander II.), the monk Hildebrand, conspicuous by his zeal and imperious will, had been made Archdeacon of Rome, and entirely governed those two pontiffs, nor is there any doubt that the decree of the former, annulling the rights of clergy and people in papal elections and limiting vote-powers to the cardinals, is due to him. In 1073 he became Gregory VII. This man's aim was not only to render the papacy independent of, but to raise it above all secular influence, also to formulate and uphold its claim to govern all principalities and nations and to possess all earthly goods. Every one of his acts, including his insistance on clerical celibacy, had these objects, and he boldly shewed his hand in the following *dictatus*, which should be carefully studied.

1. The "Church" of Rome is the only one founded by God. *
2. The title of Universal belongs only to the Bishop of Rome.
3. He alone has power to depose or absolve Bishops.
4. By his legate he presides over all councils, as over all bishops whom he may sentence to deposition.
5. The Pope may depose bishops in their absence.
6. No one may live or correspond with those whom he excommunicates.
7. He is empowered to make new laws to suit

* In some variants the Latin so runs that the translation should be "founded by God alone;" the exclusion of other Churches from the same foundation makes the two phrases of about equal import.

Digitized by Google

circumstances, create new Churches, change a chapter to an abbey, divide a rich bishopric, or join two or more poor ones.

8. He alone is permitted to assume the state and functions of the empire.
9. All princes are to kiss his feet.
10. His name is the only one to be pronounced in any church.
11. His is the one and only name in the world.
12. He has power to depose emperors.
13. He may transfer a bishop from one to another see.
14. He may ordain a vicar or clerk to any church.
15. Whomsoever he has ordained may also rule another church, but must not accept a higher grade from any bishop.
16. No council is general unless called by him.
17. No chapter law or book is canonical save by his authority.
18. No one may call into question his judgments, but he may nullify those of any and of every one.
19. No one may presume to judge or doubt him.
20. No one may dare to utter a word of blame towards him who holds the apostolic chair.
21. To this chair all questions of all Churches are to be referred.
22. The Church of Rome has never nor will it ever err.
23. Every pope canonically ordained is *ipso facto* saint.
24. Ecclesiastical prosecutions are only to be undertaken when he permits or orders them.
25. He may without a synod depose or absolve any bishop.
26. He who is not at one with the Church of Rome is not a Catholic.
27. The pope may absolve from their oath of fidelity the subjects of any prince. *

* These are in "the Epistles of Gregory VII.," Lib. II., between the 55th and 56th letters. They also are quoted by Baronius and

Digitized by Google

Hardly necessary is it to point out that if Gregory could have, unopposed, carried through these propositions, everything public or private would have been his; but much commotion on other matters also concurred at this time—*e.g.*, Investiture being profitable, he insisted on his exclusive power to grant it, and quarrelled violently with the Emperor Henry IV. Also rigid enforcement of clerical celibacy with deprivation of all married priests had excited, especially in Saxony, great resentment. A council of prelates, thirty in number, met at Worms (1076), where Cardinal Hugo (the Wise) read a very unflattering biography of Gregory (said to be that now known as of Cardinal Benno). The council passed the following resolution or decree: "As he (Gregory) favours harlotry, insults righteous marriage, and attempts to dethrone our legitimate Sovereign, we, Emperor, Bishops, Senate and Christian people, declare him deposed from the place and dignity he has usurped, and will not leave the flock of Christ longer in the guard of such a wolf." The reply of Gregory was excommunication, the great effect of which witnesses strongly to the superstition of that period; the emperor's friends and subjects deserted him and then followed his humiliation at Canossa, too well known and remembered to be recapitulated here. But we may stay a moment over two transactions. The Emperor Henry V. going to Rome (1110) to be crowned, was pressed by Pope Paschal II. to yield on the investiture question. Henry, who had brought a large force with him, seized the pope and carried him off to Sabina. There Paschal bought his release by renunciation of any claim to German investitures, confirming this contract by the following solemn oath.

other ecclesiastical historians; several among these regard them as peculiarly holy. Of late years French critics—Page, Launoy, Du Pin—have, apparently on insufficient grounds, doubted their authenticity. Yet the same ideas are expressed in less aphoristic form in Gregory's indubitable epistles.

Digitized by Google

A host was divided between the two parties and the pope said solemnly: "As these two parts are separated so shall be separated from the Kingdom of Jesus Christ he who violates this treaty." The characteristic part of the transaction is, that as soon as Henry had withdrawn with his forces from Rome, Paschal abruptly broke his oath and excommunicated the emperor. The other event is the fabrication of a will in favour of the papacy, purporting to be that of the Countess Matilda,—about the date and place when and where this document is stated to have been signed, the Romish Church is at variance with itself and no persuasion has induced it to shew a copy; it nevertheless, fastened as tight a grip as it could on what it termed "St. Peter's patrimony."

Almost entirely due to the interference of Romish bishops in the political affairs of kingdoms must the deplorable state of Europe in the 12th century be ascribed. Reckless of righteousness, having only their own supremacy in view, the bishops of Rome had for about nine centuries busied themselves in urging state against state and in using the enfeebling action of crusades whenever secular powers seemed to be acquiring sufficient vigour to inaugurate efforts at peaceful progress. Thus when, at the end of this century, Lothario Conti, alias Innocent III., was chosen pope, his enthronement address was marked by no expression of Christian humility, by no hope or prayer for help in leading the children of Jesus along the heavenward path; it is simply a haughty boast of his freshly acquired magnificence. "I have not wed my bride, the Church, dowerless; she has indeed brought me priceless gifts, fulness of spiritual and abundance of temporal possessions. As mark of the temporal she has given me the diadem, the mitre is the sign of the sacerdotal. The crown for establishing me vicar of the kingdom of Him on whose

Digitized by Google

garments and on whose thigh was writ King of Kings, Ruler of Rulers." This utterance concerning his overlordship of all princes and nations gives the keynote of his whole reign, in which he pursued a course more tyrannical than any hitherto, not even excepting Hildebrand. He began in Rome itself with abrogating popular elections to the Senate, and then in forcing the prefect, representative and plenipotentiary of the empire, to take an oath of allegiance to himself; he afterwards set about despoiling neighbouring rulers of their powers and territority. He used the alleged will of the Countess Matilda, though knowing it to be forged, for claiming the duchy of Tuscany, seized Ancona, Spoleto, Perugia and three other places. Thus strong, he was able with effect to interfere in more distant lands. He interdicted Philip von Hohenstaufen, Otho of Brunswick, Philip Augustus of France. On a question as to who should be archbishop of Canterbury, he interdicted and soon after excommunicated John of England. That ruler was a very flagitious man, but his vice had nothing to do with that latter sentence. Innocent had sent as legates to England, Pandolf and Durand. They came before John in full parliament at Nottingham and loudly declared that the King of England was bound to follow the dictates of the pope both in spiritual and in secular matters. John's refusal to accede to such absurdity brought about the excommunication. He, hated as he was, fell victim the easier; for at that time crass superstition was such that no monarch could stand against excommunications, though used merely to promote for the papacy worldly advantages. A man so greedy of power in what he chose to consider one sphere of his prerogatives would hardly brook opposition in the other. His arrogant address just quoted, marks this tone of thought; hence, when in a large part of Europe his domination over minds was questioned on scriptural

Digitized by Google

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

grounds, he did his best to extirpate not only those who read the Sacred Book, but also that Book itself, unless it were in a tongue that made it incomprehensible to the people; as is sufficiently described in Chapter XIII. Here need only be said that this is one of the reddest blots on the bloodstained annals of the Romish Church.

His tyrannical aspirations were also evidenced in 1215, when at the 4th Lateran council—a papal cabal—summoned and presided over by him, Innocent decreed that any prince who declined complying with papal commands to kill his subjects, should be excommunicated and dethroned. *

The only other pope requiring mention here is Boniface VIII., some of whose doings, are mentioned elsewhere (p. 50). The reader may, however, be reminded that he reiterated Innocent's claim to universal domination, in the bull "Unam Sanctam", which declares it "necessary to salvation that every body should be subject to the pope." He also was it, who added to the already multitudinous Romish paganisms, the old classical *ludes seculares* (century-games), now called jubilees; he decreed they should be held in the opening year of each century, but those of his successors whose lives fell in the middle of such epochs, anxious to pocket the pecuniary results, could not permit such long intervals; they now are held every 25th year, and to these, indeed, the present pope has added another sort of jubilee, being now celebrated (1902). Also while inaugurating the initial festival, Boniface clearly indicated what he meant to establish, viz., that as in ancient Rome the pontifical and imperial dignities were united in one person (himself), by appearing the first day in pontifical garb—*i.e.*

* The present pope expresses, as did Pius IX., ardent desire for doing the same thing. It is not absence of will, but of power that differentiates them from Innocent and Boniface.

Digitized by Google

in almost exactly the same vestments as the classic emperors wore in celebrating Jovian or Ceres feasts—and by wearing the next day the insignia of the imperator while celebrating some state function.

We will not trespass more widely on the reader's patience by describing further successive steps towards the attainment of autocracy; but an instance of papal impudence, since it particularly affects our own country, may here be added. On 17th Nov., 1558, Mary died. Parliament at once elected to the throne Elizabeth. She directed her late sister's agent at Rome to inform the pope of her accession. Paul IV. replied that England was held as a fief of the apostolic see, that she could not succeed, being, so he said, illegitimate, nor could he contradict the declaration made in that matter by his predecessors, Clement VII. and Paul III. *

"It was great boldness on her part to assume the crown without his consent, for which reason she deserved no favour at his hands; yet if she would renounce her pretensions and refer herself wholly to him, he would show to her a fatherly affection and would do everything for her that would consist with the dignity of the apostolic see." Two years afterwards, Pius V., on being elected pope, condemned the "mad arrogance" of his predecessor's message and tried instead to wheedle Elizabeth back into submission to Rome.

Leaving this digression, we turn back the pages of time to the period at which it was introduced, and beg the reader to observe that in little less than a thousand years after the acceptance of Christianity by Constantine the bishops of Rome had captured the chief object of their ambition —imperial status. To this point they had attained not

* It is a device of popes when they desire to decline something to represent themselves bound by a decree, whether forged or obsolete, of a predecessor; when they wish to change something they ignore even quite recent utterances and bulls, as, for instance, Pius VII. did those of Clement XIV., pronounced only thirty years previously.

Digitized by Google

by the exhibition of Christian virtue or purity—indeed in the life-histories of nearly every pope the opposite qualities are conspicuous,—but by rapine and massacre, by a series of unscrupulous forgeries and falsifications, and, to be noted especially here, by employing spiritual terrorism for the attainment of mundane advantages, that is by misuse of what is technically called "the power of the keys." The inheritance of that power by the Romish Church from Peter was shewn in Chapter I. to be mere figment; as soon as in the schools an attempt at its definition was made, it was practically denied, among others by Alanus de Insula, Bishop of Auxerre, while also he thus described Romish use of it: "But now those keys have become adulterers because they now no longer bind by the impulse and decree of God, but for the love of money; they bind that which is loose and they loose that which is bound, so that it may be said of them, Whatsoever ye bind on earth shall be loosed in Heaven and whatsoever ye loose on earth shall be bound in Heaven." Much later the consilium to amend the Church (p. 63) told the pope it was not lawful for him to make pecuniary gain out of this power. Cardinal Cajetan excited great fury in the curia by remonstrances concerning the sale of benefices; the cardinal said: "It is ridiculous that what may be given gratis may not also be sold." Melchior Canus, the most reputed theologian of his time, and Bishop of the Canaries, was, after returning from the Tridentine, commanded by Philip II. to report on the condition of Rome—thus he wrote: "He who thinks that Rome can be healed knows little of her; the whole administration of the Church is there converted into a huge trading establishment, engrossed in a traffic forbidden by all laws, human, natural and Divine."

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER VI

SCHISM

Ye are yet carnal for there are among you envyings and strifes and divisions.

AFTER the dog's death (1303) of Boniface VIII., his bastard, Cajetano, continued the strife with the Colonnas. The death by poison after a year's pontificate of Benedict XI., imposed on the conclave the task of election during severe troubles; in that assembly French and Italian cardinals, pretty equally balanced, quarrelled so persistently that for a year the chair was vacant, when by the influence, or rather command of Philip-le-Bel, the Archbishop of Bordeaux (Bertrand de Got) was chosen. His ignorance of the Italian tongue and the perturbed condition of Rome rendered residing in that city unattractive, and he required but little pressure from the king to establish the papal seat on French soil. Clement V. lived much like most of his predecessors; contemporary writers accuse him of equal pride, greed, sexual license, and nepotism, for he had a crowd of bastards. Under his auspices Avignon became filled with harlots, cut-throats and the worst sort of scoundrels, sacerdotally supported.* Contemporary writers thus describe the highly placed clerics: "They spill innocent blood;

* No account book of clerical expenditure attests this; but as there was in Avignon very little money except what came into and out of clerical pockets, the inference is inevitable.

Digitized by Google

the blood of the harmless cries out against them to the Lord. The rulers of the Church are wolves, they feed on blood, the souls of one and all thirst for gore".... "Now, God, there are within thy Church many bad sons, though she is Thine. Oh! let us have in future many good and legitimate ones. I shall say to them, how many publicans and harlots have been before you in the Kingdom of God. How many whoremongers and murderers dispeopling our country, violaters of virgins, *molles*,* traitors, parricides, most wicked sinners and unfaithful guardians of Thy House." (De Planct. Eccles. L. II. BR. 48.) Petrarch calls that city: "Fountain of woe, abode of wrath, school of deception, temple of lies, loathsome dungeon, hell on earth."

This pope was the political tool of Philip, who made him reverse all Boniface's decrees against the Colonna, permit their return and restore their possessions. He also wished that Boniface should be declared an usurper of the chair—"never pope"; but here was a difficulty. Nearly all the cardinals were of Boniface's creation and Clement had been elected by them; should they pronounce Boniface "never pope" they would annul their own position and their election of the reigning pontiff would be invalid.

After the murder of the Emperor Albrecht (1308) the papacy, had it observed some moderation, would have been able to profit in its efforts to overshadow Germany. But to Ludwig the Bavarian, after his coronation, was handed a belated letter containing the terms on which Clement proposed consenting to the ceremony, among these were demands that the emperor should under no circumstances attack Naples, nor ever enter Rome without the pope's permission. The hand of Philip was here so evident that peace between the empire on the one hand, France and the papacy on the other, was impossible. The

* This word must be left untranslated, every student of mediæval Latin knows its meaning. Clemanges places Clement among these.

Digitized by Google

aggressive meddling of popes produced the meeting of imperial electors at Reuss and the decision that the emperor's rights were not derived from the pope, but from the choice and votes of the electors.

On the death of Clement (1314) disorders again caused a two years' vacancy, till Philip forced another Frenchman on the chair. Deuse's (John XXII.) reign was chiefly signalized by the claim that the whole of Germany belonged to him and by a command laid on other powers to conquer her. He also sent to Constantinople a haughtily worded mandate, that the Greek should submit to the Romish Church; the reply ran: "We fully believe that you have unlimited power over those, who subject themselves to you; but we will neither tolerate your insolence nor satisfy your greed. Go to the devil, for God is with us."

No event of importance to our immediate subject occurred,* but at the death of Gregory XI. an important split of the papacy took place. The prosperity of Rome had for long depended on the influx of wealthy pilgrims anxious to deposit offerings at shrines and to take part in various papal pageants. The diversion of these advantages to Avignon had disgusted the people, who let Gregory know that unless he returned to the historic seat, he would be deposed. St. Catherine of Siena, who assumed the mission of dictating what they should or should not do to infallible popes, and also Petrarch exhorted him to make his entry with no other guard than a crucifix, no other pomp than psalmody. But the war with Florence, which Urban had instigated, still going on had produced so disturbed a condition that the pope did not relish the proposal; he entered Rome protected by an entire free-lance company, preceded by dancers and posture-mongers. One of his first

* The reader may be reminded that Gregory XI. occupied himself much with combating the nineteen Articles of Wycliffe.

Digitized by Google

acts was to more sharply enforce the interdict on Florence, and to decree that all her citizens should be the slaves of any who could capture them. Among the places that adhered to the papacy was Cesena, Robert of Geneva, its cardinal, resided there, guarded by a free company, which by outrages angered the citizens, who, in self-defence, one day killed several of the band. The cardinal sent privately during the night for another set of these mercenaries and ordered it to murder the inhabitants. Over eight thousand of them took refuge in the woods and hills; and between four and five thousand corpses lay unburied in the streets. This happened one month after the return of the pope; the bloody celebration of the event was probably approved by him, at least no word of censure or regret was uttered. A contemporary poet in one of his sonnets called Gregory "Pope Slaughter-folk" (Papa Guasta-monde). A shudder of anger and horror ran through Italy, and many were heard to curse the pope and all his works. Florence, suffering much from the interdicts and losing one by one her allies, was obliged to negotiate, but the pope's death interrupted all business; in less than a year after the atrocious celebration of his return, the chair was vacant (1378).

For seventy-five years no conclave had met in Rome; on this occasion sixteen cardinals, of whom but four were Italian, assembled. The people, intensely excited, went armed about the streets and surrounded the Vatican, shouting: "We will have a Roman or at least an Italian pope." To elect another Frenchman was dangerous; nevertheless, the choice fell on Prignano, half French half Italian, and at the conclusion of the voting the people were already forcing the door of the conclave chamber. Afraid to avow their choice, the cardinals, dressing the senile Tibaldeschi in pontifical robes, placed him on a chair in a contiguous chapel. The duped people took no notice of his asseveration, "I am not

Digitized by Google

pope." Some of them paid him reverence, others rushed into the street, shouting: "We have a Roman pope." The cardinals thus got time to escape; some shut themselves in St. Angelo, some in their houses, while four managed to leave the city. These latter declared that the conclave having been terrorized, the election of Prignano, alias Urbanus VI., was invalid. They met that same year at Fondi and installed, under the name of Clement VII., Robert of Geneva. Thus began the great schism; men's minds were utterly confused. No one knew which was canonically pope; in point of fact, neither were so. Sts. Catherine and Bridget adhered to Urban; St. Vincent and the happy (*beatus*) Pier of Luxembourg to Clement. German prelates sided mostly with the former; French ones chiefly with the latter. Antoninus of Florence was entirely bewildered, while Roselwink, author of "Fasciculi temporum," says that "from this time no one knew who was pope." Several cardinals oscillated between one and the other, and it was either way a sorry choice, for one was the blood-stained butcher of Cesena, the other was—but we must take a little space to depict the other.

Cardinal Prignano had always been considered as of a retiring, even diffident disposition; whether that was his real character or mere mask cannot now be determined. As Urban VI., he was the very impersonation of discord; that he scattered curses with liberal lips upon Clement and all who helped him is matter of course. With Joan of Naples he almost immediately quarrelled, for she possessed a territory which he coveted for his bastard, nick-named Butillo, and she had received and abetted the other pope. To form a new college he illegally created in a single day twenty cardinals, and quarrelled with them almost immediately. This strife and its causes will shortly be described, but we will first consider his dissension

Digitized by Google

with Joan, of whom Clement VI. had bought Avignon, but hating to part with money, had transmuted the stipulated price into a declaration that she was not guilty of her husband's murder and into recognition of her Neapolitan possession. Urban reversed this infallible decree and pronounced her a murderess, ordered her deposition and commissioned the King of Hungary, the uncle of Joan's deceased husband, to enforce the decree. That king furnished Durazzo with troops, while Urban, by appropriating the gold and silver of many churches, procured funds on condition that Durazzo, when victorious, should hand over Capua to Butillo. Durazzo succeeded in his expedition, but failed in his compact; thereupon Urban started for Naples; but Durazzo intercepted and imprisoned him at Aversa, whence he was shortly after suffered to escape. The pope and his free-lance company underwent a siege in the fortress of Nocera, during which, four times a day, he took a bell, a book and a candle to an outer balcony and solemnly swore at the besiegers, to the great amusement of the soldiers. It had been hinted to him that certain cardinals were planning his deposition; he had them lowered into an almost empty tank, wherein the remaining putrid water teemed with worms and reptiles; he gave them just sufficient food to support life, often walking in the neighbouring galleries that he might watch the executioners, while pretending to read his breviary. Butillo, seated on the brink, burst into fits of brutal laughter, at their groans and despairing gestures. Urban meanwhile, save in the way of the above comic cursing, not acting as a priest, but rather as a captain of disorderly free-lances, broke out of Nocera and set off to Genoa. On the way one of the cardinals excited his suspicions; he had him clubbed and left the body as carrion in the road. Arrived at Genoa, the inhabitants interceded for the remaining six

Digitized by Google

cardinals; he promised to spare them, but that same night had them sewn into sacks and thrown into the sea, except one, an Englishman, for whom Richard II. intervened.

In the meantime at Avignon the very murderous Robert of Geneva, now called Clement VII., was leading the same licentious and avaricious life as was habitual with popes. Like others, he had a crowd of "nephews." The two disputants, neither being rightfully pope, were continually swearing at one another, each applying to his rival such terms as Anti-Christ, Satan's emissary, etc., and each using all endeavours to frustrate what the other tried to do. For instance, Clement pointed out to Joan that she might obtain assistance against Durazzo by adopting as heir to the throne of Naples, Louis d'Anjou, thus kindling another of those papo-Neapolitan wars which so frequently were the bane of Europe and the deadly scourge of Italy. Much of this particular war was maritime, carried on chiefly by aid of subsidized pirates, among whom were the three brothers Cossa, Baldassare being the most cunning and ruthless. His two brothers were captured and hanged; he, profiting by the lesson, realized that the Church offered a safer and more lucrative field for his predatory talents. His licentious life at the university of Bologna, and still more his violence and cruelty as archdeacon there, led to his excommunication by Gregory XII.; but his management of the indulgence market (p. 65) was too profitable to allow of keeping him unemployed; he therefore was soon reinstated. At this time the condition of the Church and of popes, if indeed there was a pope, was even more disgraceful than usual. At Avignon Clement VII. had been followed by Benedict XIII. (1394), Gregory XII. succeeded (1406) Innocent in Italy; some countries acknowledged one, some the

Digitized by Google

other. In order to reduce the confusion, certain cardinals met at Pisa (1409), deposed one of the pretenders as irregularly elected, the other as "schismatical, heretical, perjured and scandalous," appointing Philargo, alias Alexander V. There were, therefore, three people quarrelling about the Romish stool, not one of them having any right to sit there. In the year following the Pisan election Cossa poisoned Philargo at Bologna, where, being all powerful, he easily secured the popedom under the name of John XXII. or XXIII. * This gave him great opportunities for increasing his villainies. As a result of this and of the confusion, all Europe by the year 1414 was disgusted and dismayed at the condition to which in a thousand years of rule the Romish Church had reduced Christendom, therefore princes and people, both lay and cleric, demanded a general council to reform the whole papacy both in "head and members." Indeed the state of that institution from top to bottom required very drastic remedies; the shameless profligacy of the priesthood, from pope to pardoner, had become unbearable, "setting the vilest example before the people" and furnishing the chief cause of their misery and the brutish license that characterised much of the Middle Ages. Among those who pleaded that those professing to teach Christianity should not be the most conspicuous leaders in debauch (p. 40) were the still remaining Waldenses, Wycliffe and his followers in Bohemia, Huss and Jerome; but the chief force in procuring a council was Sigismund, King of the Romans (subsequently emperor). John XXIII. greatly dreaded a council; finding it inevitable, he endeavoured to call the meeting at Bologna or some other Italian town, but the king firmly refused, and at length Constance was fixed upon. Thither in October 1414 John repaired

* The numeration of Johns is confused by several irregularities, among them, the in- or exclusion of Joan.

Digitized by Google

with a brilliant court, with guards, dancers, jugglers and a great horde of vile women. Sigismund, detained, did not arrive till Christmas. Meanwhile the Italian prelates, under John's direction, had endeavoured to smother the burning question of reform under endless and fruitless discussions on abstruse points of dogma, and John still hoped by the votes of those clerics to overwhelm those of the other members; but a regulation was passed that voting should not be by individuals, but by nations; this struck the chief-weapon of his defence out of John's hand. Then partly by the firmness and clear arguments of d'Ailly and Gerson, partly by the good sense of Sigismund, but chiefly by circulation among the members of John's biography, the so-called pope was brought to submission. The document alluded to recorded a number of horrible crimes,—adultery, violation of nuns and others, murders, atrocious cruelty etc. The accusations were never denied; but in the fear that this biography should be read at one of the meetings, John could not openly resist his suspension. A belief became prevalent, however, that he meant to leave and, arrived at a safe place, to dissolve the council and evade his promise of resignation. The town-gates and he himself were watched, but by a trick concocted with Friedrich, Duke of Austria, he escaped (20th March) disguised as a groom. In the 4th and 5th session (27th March and 6th April) the superiority of councils over popes was decreed thus: "That a council lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost represents the Catholic Church Militant and derives its power direct from Christ. Every human being of whatever status, be he even the pope, is bound to obey in all matters pertaining to faith and suppression of the schism."* On the 25th May the council deposed John. On 24th July Gregory XII.

* This decree should be especially noted, its importance in the light of after-events is great.

Digitized by Google

abdicated, but Benedict XIII., who had fled to Perpignan, insisted that he was the only canonical pope; he died in 1423, and had a successor who reigned, at least in his own conceit, till 1429. The council had elected Otto Colonna (Martin V.), the deposed ones being (this is important) still alive. Colonna was chosen on the condition that he would proceed to reform the Church, would amend the constitution of the chancery, moderate the amount and methods of its taxation. As soon as he was enthroned he "postponed clerical reform till a more convenient opportunity" and confirmed all procedures of the chancery as formulated by John, thus shewing his contempt of conciliar decrees and his determination not to amend the criminality of the Church. The Council of Constance had not made one step in the direction of reform; but it had decreed that councils should be held every five years, and, as above, the superiority of such meetings over popes. Another thing it, together with the Council of Pisa, had, though unwittingly, done—they had completely severed whatever shred of papal succession from the apostles remained; for if either Gregory XII. or Benedict XIII. were rightful successors, those at Pisa had no power to appoint during their lifetime other popes—Alexander V. and John XXIII. were illegally chosen, so also by the Constance council was Martin V. Indeed, as is shewn elsewhere, many popes have since pronounced that no council has this power, and the bull called In Cœna Domini asserted this in the churches every year for two or three centuries.

Martin V. occupied himself with politics and with frustrating every attempt to reform the Church; he dared not disobey the Constance decree for calling quinquennial councils, but as soon as the one he summoned touched on a project of reform he dissolved it. Dying in 1431, he was succeeded by Eugenius IV.

Digitized by Google

(Condelmiero). Disappointed with the sum he found in Martin's treasury, he accused the Colonnas of theft and attacked them; street fighting ensued and the pope's party was worsted, until the emperor forced a reconciliation. He was vain, grasping, quarrelsome and up to a certain point obstinate, yet as soon as his personal comfort or safety was involved he yielded at once, even points which just previously he declared necessary to salvation. That which chiefly interests us are his dealings with the lawfully assembled Council of Basel and the abortive attempt to reunite the Greek and Latin Churches. The former met in July 1431, but did nothing until December; it then wrote to the Hussite leaders, inviting them to attend, while promising safe conduct and a favourable hearing. This was weak, as in very similar language the same had been promised to Huss and Jerome.* It did not therefore decoy the Bohemians and it bitterly angered the pope, who, though warned by Cardinal Cessario, issued a bull dissolving the council; but it declined to be dissolved, and Sigismund wrote to Eugenius a letter of remonstrance which, though disregarded by the pope, no doubt encouraged the assembly at Basel, defended in speech and writing by the clever controversialist (a humanist child of the renaissance), Æneas Sylvius, who was its secretary. He wrote many tractates, called dialogues, proving irrefutably that, in all Church matters, councils were supreme, and that popes were bound to obey their decrees; also that such might assemble independent of papal summons, and could not be lawfully prorogued or dissolved save at their own free will. The meeting reaffirmed the decision of Constance, that

* Certain compacts were concluded with the Bohemian Church, the most important being concession of the right to administer the Eucharist in its two forms. It was their insistance on this that earned for those religionists the names of Utraquists and Calixtines.

Digitized by Google

councils of the Church, thus lawfully assembled, derive their power direct from Christ, and that "he who should disobey their decrees, were it even the pope, shall be punished." Going on to specify the matters that called for immediate reform, the council attacked nepotism by decreeing that no pope should thereafter provide his nephews or other near relatives with principalities and wealth. It also ordered the abolition of annates, reservations, the very exorbitant price of the pallium and some other extortions, thus striking at a system which, gradually growing for many centuries, had come to be a chief source of the enormous papal and curial income. Seriously alarmed at the course the council was now pursuing, dreading even more trenchant action and finding his attempts to dissolve it futile, Eugenius fell back on conciliation; he repudiated, though it certainly was his, the authorship of a vituperative document, and wrote a letter acknowledging the legality of the council, using his utmost endeavours to transfer it to an Italian city, where, by swamping the majority of votes in favour of reform and being supported by his own creatures, he could divert discussion into side issues. The council, taking a loftier tone, responded by sending him a summons to appear before it, and on his failure to do so, deposed him and elected in his stead the abdicated Duke of Savoy, under the name of Felix V. Thus again was schism.

At this time events occurred which greatly aided Eugenius and destroyed the work of the Basel council. In 1054, the Greek Church had separated from the Romish ostensibly on the addition to the Nicene creed by the former of the "filioque clause," in reality because "Rome would brook no equal, Constantinople no superior." Times, however, in the East were changed, the Mussulman had conquered large districts in Asia, and was threatening Bithynia; Constan-

Digitized by Google

tinople itself was in danger. The emperor (Constantine) was willing to purchase the aid of the pope in summoning princes to save the Eastern empire, by rejoining the Romish Church, which Eugenius had declared a *sine qua non*. He seized the opportunity of again proposing that the council should adjourn to an Italian town, averring that such would be more convenient for the Greek delegates. The council etc. also, desiring the honor of the reconcilement declined to move; this was an error in strategy, as when the Emperor and the Patriarch Joseph crossed over to Italy, they preferred Ferrara. *

Thus Basel was overshadowed: Eugenius jubilant and thinking it a fine chance for personal display, ordered a magnificent crown to be made of 15 lbs. of pure gold and 5½ of large jewels (valued at 38,000 gold florins). He arranged a pageant in such wise that he should sit on a throne higher than both emperors, with the gorgeously robed Western prelates on his right, the Eastern on his left, so he intended to dominate secularly and sacerdotally, with all that weight of splendacious costliness on his vain head; but he was not allowed quite so imposing a position. Very wearisome were the long discussions, chiefly oscillating about the "filioque clause." In about three months, aided by Bessarion's verbal acumen, it was discovered that all this time they had been talking, all these centuries disagreeing about nothing. The view now propounded was: "The Father is the origin of the Son, therefore procession from the Father by or through the Son is the same as procession from the Father and the Son." The next, and indeed to Eugenius the main point was Romish supremacy; this also, in a somewhat restricted sense, was ceded by the Easterns; but a little before conclusion of the

* An outbreak of plague caused transference to Florence, by which name this council is known.

Digitized by Google

conference the Patriarch Joseph died, the pope offered to consecrate a successor *gratuitously;* probably it was this last word, an anomally in papal mouths, that excited their suspicion; declining to let such a precedent be established, they explained that by their custom the patriarch could only be ordained by their own prelates and in Constantinople. Notwithstanding this disappointment, counterbalanced by other successes, Eugenius was exultant, but only for a time. When Constantine and the clerics disembarked on their return, they were reproached with having given away the liberties of the Greek Church, which utterly refused to ratify the convention; the negotiations came to nothing.

It was plain that with all the talk nothing was being done to ameliorate the management and condition of the Church, for which both France and Germany were pressing. In the latter country King Friedrich (Sigismund died in 1437) demanded a general œcumenical council, and in this he was joined by the Archbishops of Trier and Köln. Popes, however, always abhor the very name of a reform, and at this juncture Eugenius, dreading the exposure of sundry simoniacal transactions and several misappropriations of Church money for merely personal objects, forbade those prelates to move in the matter, and, as they continued to do so, deposed them; whereupon Friedrich wrote that, unless the archbishops' inhibitions were withdrawn, he would transfer his and his country's obedience to Felix; Eugenius at once yielded.

We must trace a little further the career of Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, one of the most prominent figures in this stage of the revival; his historical writings, though much biassed, are valuable as contemporary records; his poetical works are chiefly occupied with the praise of gross sensuality which he miscalls love; his dramatic works are filthy, in none of these is, there a trace of noble sentiment or loftiness of aim.

Digitized by Google

Nevertheless, an extremely clever man, he had the power of adapting himself to all circumstances and people, a power which would deserve the name sympathetic had his aim been other than keen self-seeking, but being so it can only be called shifty. Arriving as a layman (1432), secretary to Bishop Capranica at the Basel council, he exercised much influence there and wrote, as we have seen, in favour of the superiority of such assemblies over popes, and (quoted elsewhere) scathingly of corruption in the Church and the evils of nepotism, etc. Regarding, however, the election of Felix V. as a false step, he transferred his services to Friedrich, who crowned him poet-laureate at Vienna, where he led a scandalously loose life. Having deserted the council, he turned his energies in the contrary direction, endeavouring to win the emperor for the cause of Eugenius and papal autocracy, taking care to keep the pope well informed of his efforts, and in 1445 he offered humble apologies to him for his divagations at Basel, was received into favour and sent back to further influence the emperor. At length, in 1447, he was able to bring to the moribund pontiff the imperial submission. The next two years under the pontificates of Nicholas V. and Calixtus III. were occupied chiefly in still further subjecting the empire to the papacy; the Germans said that he owed his advancement entirely to their nation "and repaid it by selling its liberties to the pope." Æneas had taken orders and the emperor pressed Calixtus to create him cardinal, but the favour was refused until that pope had first promoted his own bastards. At length the object of his ambition was obtained (1456) the red hat was accorded him by Calixtus, who died less than two years after. The Easterns had sent to Nicholas V. many petitions that he would incite princes to send an army to the defence of Constantinople; he refused

Digitized by Google

unless the Eastern Church, accepted the whole programme of the Florentine council, and submitted to his supremacy. At the time Nicholas was reproached that he sacrificed a Christian empire to the infidel rather than yield a tittle of his unwarranted prerogatives.

On the demise of Calixtus Æneas Sylvius won his election (1458) and at once preached a fresh Turk-tax, the result was merely an addition to the papal treasury and even this was disappointingly small. Our chief point of interest with Pius II. lies in the bull "Execrabilis." While secretary to the Basel council he had written incisively concerning the greedy venality of the Church (p. 98) and had strongly asserted the superiority over popes of councils. But having become pontifex, he in that bull declared that to call or even to think of a council was an abominable sin, and that such meetings could enact nothing that opposed or even modified papal decrees and pronouncements. According to his changed ideas, the one duty of life was to obey and yield up all mental independence, all liberty of conscience and all of spiritual and material life into the hands of a man who, whether fairly, by bribery, or by the bait of influence and wealth, had won an election in a remarkably small constituency. The bull ends: "Whoever contravenes this decree, be he of whatever status, class, order or condition, aye! even be he illustrious with imperial, royal or pontifical dignity, does by that very act incur condemnation (execratio), from which he can only be freed at the point of death by the Romish pontiff," a piece of arrogance the absurdity of which is shown by the call for councils six several times by persons of "pontifical dignity." This bull effected one thing of which Pius probably had not dreamt; the succession of popes had been frequently interrupted by heresy, simony, ill-conduct and by schism.

Digitized by Google

Æneas Sylvius was elected by the votes of cardinals owing their hats and their status to Martin V. and his successors; but the bull decreed that councils had no right to interfere with popes, neither to depose nor to elect them, therefore Martin was never pope; all his acts, including the making of cardinals, were null, and Pius himself therefore, having been elected by non-valid cardinals was not pope, nor indeed has any one been canonically so for more than five hundred years.

Digitized by Google

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER VII

THE ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION

Drawing sin as it were with a cart rope.

THE bull "Execrabilis" freed popes from the fear of corrective councils, the effect of which is set forth in the next few pages.

Pius' successor was Pietro Barbo (1467—71). His choice by the conclave was on condition that he would refrain from nepotism, purify sacerdotal conduct, and within three years summon a council to reform the Church in head and members; to these conditions Paul II. swore, and signed a paper containing them. Very soon after his enthronement he placed before the cardinals a different document, demanding their signature. They were not even allowed to see it; those who refused were compelled, as was Bessarion, by force; nothing more was heard of the original script, nor of its stipulations. Barbo was an exceedingly vain man on his election, but for the opposition of the cardinals he would have taken the name of Formosus; he adorned his person gorgeously and berouged himself profusely. The Vatican, infested by loose women, was the scene of constant debauch; writers of the time applied to it such epithets as cannot with decency be quoted. Although he thus would spend money on illicit pleasures and on ostentatious display, yet was he even more keen in acquisition. Thus, Cardinal Scarampo had devised to his children a for-

Digitized by Google

tune in gold and jewels, valued at 200,000 gold ducats. Barbo broke the will and purloined the valuables. He suddenly dismissed many members of the college of abbreviatori, thus saving salaries to a considerable yearly amount. These men, however, having but shortly before paid pretty dearly for their places, protested. Platina, the most persistent remonstrant, was imprisoned and almost starved to death in St. Angelo. Rather more than a year afterwards a rumour arose that the pope's life was threatened by a conspiracy. There was no reason, save the pope's sense of his injustice, for connecting the abbreviatori with the alleged plot. Yet Paul had them all, save some few who escaped, thrown into prison and horribly tortured; their complete innocence became after a few months clear. By such means as the above, Barbo collected a huge amount of money, having been heard frequently to say that his "treasure chest contained fabulous sums." Sudden death by accidental or prearranged fall of his sitting-room ceiling, forestalled testamentary dispositions.

The son of a poor Ligurian fisherman, Francesco della Revere, a man, therefore, without hereditary wealth, took, together with the chair, the alias of Sixtus IV. (1471—1484); and though he complained of having found but 2000 crowns in his predecessor's treasury, yet he very soon showed by his own, as by his bastards' and nephews' expenditure, how far from the truth such assertion must have been; also it was known that Paul had amassed a quantity of gold and jewels, valued at several millions. Shameless as the nepotism of many previous popes had been, it had never reached such cynical audacity as now. Even while still cardinal he had ordained one of his brood, Giuliano, to a valuable bishopric, and immediately after enthronement he added three more and also several less lucrative benefices. Pietro Riario was at

Digitized by Google

the same time made cardinal and provided with as many pluralities; to another Riario, when not quite sixteen years old, was also given a red hat. The feast given by Pietro when Leonora of Arragon passed through Rome astonished all Europe, the wildest imaginations were employed in devising extravagancy rather than beauty; the figures and names of the old classic gods were presented as objects of admiration, even one may say of adoration, by life-size and colossal figures decked in gold and jewels. The other nephews and bastards followed suit. Infessura, the annalist, in an endeavour to excuse these excesses, says: "The wealth of the Church must somehow be expended." One cannot but feel that he might have given some intimation of how it was obtained, of how every land was groaning under the impoverishment produced by papal exactions enforced by threats of eternal damnation, of how, by the sale of bishoprics and livings to any one with money, regardless of character, all countries were flooded with ignorant "monsters" who, under the pretext of sacerdotal powers, corrupted nations and dishonoured Christianity, as the eight cardinals on Paul III.'s committee to amend the Church declared (p. 121).

But Sixtus did not limit his favours to the mere enrichment of his bastards etc., he wanted for them princely or at least ducal titles. By selling the ancient church-tax on Naples he bought for one of his bastards, of King Ferrante, the duchy of Urbino, burdened, however, with the hand of his daughter. By another alienation of Church property he procured Imola for Girolamo. One cannot be quite sure whether Sixtus' ambition went so far as to covet Florence for Rafaele, or whether his action there was simply vengeful. Certain is it that Lorenzo dei Medici had on more than one occasion thwarted the pope's designs. Sixtus dismissed him from the office of

Digitized by Google

treasurer and appointed Francesco Pazzi, a rival already jealous of Lorenzo, and thus gained a zealous accomplice in Florence itself; then he, two or three of his bastards, Archbishop Salviati and Pazzi arranged their plot. When on 26th April, 1478, the two brothers dei Medici were at high mass in the Florentine cathedral, that act which the Romish Church professes to venerate as most sacred was utilized as a murder-signal. At the elevation of the host, assassins, led by the Riarios, rushed to the attack; Giuliano was fatally stabbed, Lorenzo escaped. Sixtus, furious at this failure, excommunicated him (penalty for escaping murder), laid Florence under interdict and, aided by the Neapolitans, levied against her a violent war. Mahomet II. had profited by these disturbances due solely to the pope's greed for the advancement of his family; the crescent had long floated over the citadel of Otranto, and had not the Sultan died (May 1481) Rome might have become a centre of Islam. That death, however, left the papal hands free for further intrigues with Venice for the acquisition of Ferrara; siding with Malatesta, then with Sforza, betraying both, clamouring for war while secular princes, more Christian than the head of the Romish Church, were urging peace. Then an event, longed for in every land and which the contemporary chroniclist, Infessura, described as most fortunate, occurred—the pope died (Aug. 1484). But the spirit of discord in Rome had been too deeply stirred to allow of immediate subsidence. The people, angered at the taxation, usury, and appropriation by the Riarios of food-stuffs only sold at high prices, plundered in the city; the Colonnas were at war with the Riarios, many of the barons were in revolt. In this pandemonium the conclave chamber had to be fortified.

The choice lay between Roderigo Borja and Baptisto Cibo, and the election was carried on cynically,

Digitized by Google

by open and unconcealed bribery; the latter won, though the Romans said that Innocent VIII.'s only merit was the paternity of sixteen bastards, sons and daughters in equal numbers, for whose advancement, careless of the miseries inflicted, he intrigued and warred. He sold to Lorenzo for his second son, a boy of ten and a half years, a cardinal's hat, on consideration of certain monies down and the hand of his daughter Maddalena for his reprobate bastard Franceschetto. At the espousal feast in the Vatican women of public immorality sat at table with him, cardinals and other holy fathers. An even greater degradation was inflicted on Christendom: the pope had preached a crusade against the Turks; this was proved to be merely a device for pocketing the Turk-tax by his almost immediately bargaining with Bajezet, whose brother Djem, failing in his contest for the throne, had fled first to Egypt then to Rhodes. The pope's overtures ended in an agreement to keep the prince at Rome for an annual stipend of 25,000 gold ducats. As soon as he had Djem in his power, he raised his gaoler-wage to 40,000; in the following year he demanded that three years should be paid as a lump sum in advance; having got the coin he resumed his advocacy of a crusade. Bajazet knowing that only a certain golden influx into papal pockets would result, did not let the incident disturb even his temper, as shewn by his gift, a year or so after, to Cibo of "the holy spear." Although two or three specimens of this weapon had in bygone times been brought from Jerusalem, * no inquiry as to the genesis and preservation of this new one was made; it was too good an opportunity for decoying "pious offerings" to be endangered by such frivolous enquiry. He organized many processions

* One was in England.—Lord Herbert of Cherbury (p. 213).

Digitized by Google

and ceremonies, advertising vast other-world advantages for those who should pay for the privilege of worshipping this piece of old iron.

His renewal of war against the unoffending Waldenses, and his appointment of the fiendish Torquemada as chief inquisitor, are of a piece with his bull "Summis Desiderantes," of which the foul book "Malleus Maleficorum" is but an expansion. This bull asserted on the authority of infallibility, that a great many people had carnal intercourse with Satan, sometimes simply in his own shape, sometimes in that of "succubus or incubus," and that the fiend paid them by bestowing on them the power of injuring their neighbours.* Persons thus criminal were described as plentifully infesting Germany, that country being selected because the people, averse to having their friends burnt for conscientious tenets, furnished only what Cibo thought insufficient pasture for his much beloved inquisition fires. Thus the pope, though he did not originate the idea of witchcraft, instituted those trials and those shocking witch-baitings which so long disgraced Europe, and a few years later also America.

While the Romish Church treated disapproval of her doings, calling it heresy, with the utmost cruelty, murderers, thieves, violaters, etc. were given for money complete impunity. All verdicts were openly sold by the pope; his evil-minded grandson Franceschetto acting as intermediary. The vice-camerlengo being asked why so few of such criminals were brought to justice, replied jeeringly, that "Christ does not desire the death of a sinner, but that he should live and *pay*;" under such a government there is no room for astonishment that during the last few weeks of Cibo's

* Much of the nonsense in this bull is, like many Romish ideas, taken direct from ancient Roman paganism, but many phantasies are too grotesquely prurient to have been conceived by the classic imagination.

Digitized by Google

moribundence two hundred and twenty murders were committed in the streets of Rome. It is impossible to determine whether Innocent VIII. was most sordid, godless, superstitious, faithless or cruel. Had he not been followed by Borja, his death, (25th July, 1491,) like that of his predecessor, would have been considered a most auspicious event.

This time Borja was resolved to succeed, and knowing the characteristics of the Sacred College, he used the only means that in such a constituency would be efficacious—enormous bribery. Not gold only was lavished; offices reputed the most sacred in what still was called the Christian Church, were bartered for votes. And so the conclave, presided over and inspired theoretically by the Holy Ghost, elected Roderigo Borja (Alexander VI.) head of Romish Catholicism, though every man in the assembly knew that he was entirely conscienceless and depraved. By romance writers of the "dreadful" style of literature the character of this man has been seized on partly to depict a combination of power and crime, partly to add a glamour of historic interest to their narratives, and these writers have no doubt described quite apocryphal events. On the other hand, by papal partizans several of his deeds perfectly well authenticated have been, with much effrontery, denied.

All records of his early life show that Roderigo Borja was grossly sensual, undeterred by scruples his animalism, if such word be not an insult to the four-footed, was enormous; he had, too, another characteristic of the predatory beast, a great fierce love of offspring, for whom he cherished most ambitious designs, dissimulated under a guise of cheerful genial manner, and by publicly pronounced aspirations towards purity and goodness. Thus when, soon after his enthronement, his bastard Cæsar came before him, he told him in the presence of all the court, that

Digitized by Google

favour depended entirely on his leading a virtuous and holy life. Cæsar confided his astonished dismay to his mother, who, thoroughly knowing the pope's character, told him he need trouble himself about neither virtue nor holiness. During the early years of his pontificate Borja dreaded exposure of his simoniacal capture of the chair, and he took means (chiefly poison) of getting rid of such cardinals as could and, as he feared, would denounce it and procure his deposition. Cardinal della Rovere, pondering on the rapid death of some of his colleagues, fled to France, and endeavoured to induce Charles VIII. to summon a council for that very purpose. Other difficulties lay in Alexander's way—*e.g.*, paucity of funds for annexing all Italy as a family possession; the princes saw his object more or less clearly, and thoroughly distrusted him; he had no friend in Christendom; his one intimate was the Sultan. To maintain his position, known by all to be wrongfully acquired, to avoid disclosure of crimes already committed, to refill rapidly emptied coffers, to remove a political opponent or possessor of a coveted territory, he was driven from murder to murder. So perished several cardinals, who, invited to the Vatican, were poisoned, their possessions seized even before life was extinct. No greater ignominy could be inflicted on Western Christianity than that its head should accept a bribe of 20,000 ducats from Bajazet to murder his brother the Prince Djem. For the same object he extended and cheapened the use of indulgences, claimed power to release from the places of either temporal or eternal punishment the souls of those long dead, on payment to him by surviving relatives of money; for absolution of the still living neither contrition nor amendment, but only payment was required, not even a mass was necessary, a mere visit to some church with ready money in hand sufficed. Whoever doubted was declared heretic.

Digitized by Google

When Charles VIII. occupied Rome the pope, shut up in St. Angelo, (November 1494) was hourly expecting deposition. Again bribery stood him in good stead; the promise of a red hat to the king's minister produced intercession in his favour. After about six months' occupation of Naples, the French force retreated beyond the Alps; the pope's hand was free for the desired confiscation of Italy. Cæsar, in 1497, murdered his brother the Duke of Gandia.* After this, Alexander was, it seems, in dread, and under the domination of that truculent ruffian. Spoliation and violent crime became more cynically open. Rome was infested by hired Spanish miscreants who, at Borja's bidding, broke into houses, pillaged or murdered the owners. Lucrezia was used as a bait, rather as false coin, to attract or buy alliance; hardly worth while is it to count how many times in seven or eight years she was betrothed, married, divorced, remarried, etc. One of her many husbands was murdered by Cæsar, before whose ruthlessness all Italy trembled or armed. Rome was a pandemonium of violence and vice. At length deliverance came; at a supper to which Cardinal Adrian had, for the customary purpose, been invited, both the pope and Cæsar drank of their own poison. Several attempts have been made by over-zealous papists to whitewash this man's character, such efforts are futile, as Pastor and all the more candid of that persuasion confess. Even the Civilta Cattolica, which does not stick at trifles, acknowledges (15th March, 1873,) the uselessness of such defence.

In the year (1503) of Borja's death, della Rovere —who, having opposed him, carefully hid from his vengeance—was elected pope. Julius II. was an un-

* Doubt of this fact is irrational, though it is attested by no actual eye-witness it is pretty clearly proved, and the pope's agonized reiterated cry, "I know the murderer," shows that the death of one son was less painful than the knowledge that it was compassed by the other.

Digitized by Google

scrupulous diplomatist and soldier of no mean capacity, whose objects in life were, like those of his predecessor, family aggrandizement, to be achieved by subjection under his sway of all other Italian states. Of any action for religious objects, there is in his whole reign no trace, save the obligatory summoning of a council (5th Lateran, 1512—17), which he had deferred as long as possible. In order to gain possession of Rimini, Faenza and other places then occupied by Venice, he formed an alliance against the republic with France and Germany, and so seized upon certain fortresses in the Romagna. Dissatisfied with the result, he himself donned armour (1506) and captured Bologna and Perugia, concluded with Louis XII. and with Maximilian the League of Cambrai against the maritime state, which he also placed under interdict, and which in 1510 submitted. As, however, the lion's share of the prey did not fall into his mouth, he betrayed the league, joined the Venetians against France and interdicted that country; his efforts to embroil England and France in war failed. Disgusted with the treacheries of this pope, Louis XII. organized a synod of French bishops at Tours (1510), which refused obedience to Julius, and in the following year five cardinals escaped papal vigilance in Rome, fled to Milan and arranged a council at Pisa with the express object of voiding the chair, which the Emperor Maximilian thought of occupying. It was not until this meeting threatened danger, that Julius fulfilled his oath and called, after manifold delays, the 5th Lateran council above mentioned; but he died very soon after the first meeting. This council is chiefly notorious as the first in which, under the impulse of Leo X., popes were pronounced superior to councils.

Julius was a mere worldling. He had confirmed papal autocracy in the immediate vicinity of Rome; but quite failed in his main object, the subjection of Italy

Digitized by Google

under sway of the dei Roveri. The tyrannized and overtaxed people hated him; they who, in the early years of his pontificate, had called him Jupiter and Mars, now entitled him in the later "Wolf in sheep's clothing—cruel devastator—scourge of the human race." The Romish Church was at the end of his reign held in greater contempt than even at its beginning. Yet one thing worthy of remark he did: as a decoration to what he had hoped to make his own imperial city, he began the building of St. Peter's. Another episode marks this reign—the visit on a mission from his cloister of an obscure German monk. He came with ardent desire to behold the beauty of perfected worship in the centre of Western Christianity. Luther returned to Erfurt (1511) a disillusioned man.

Giovanni dei Medici next won election; he was the second son of Lorenzo, who had in 1488 bought of Cibo a cardinal's hat for him, when ten and a half years old. Leo X. inherited his father's love of display; his taste was noted as more equivocal, and his habit of invoking pagan deities more remarkable, than his knowledge of classic literature; but he liked to pose as a Mæcenas, profuse in shows and banquets, not only on special occasions, but daily or almost daily. On ascending the chair he said: "Since God has given me the papacy I intend to enjoy it." His profusion was unmeasured; the continual feasts in the Vatican, at which notorious courtizans sat with cardinals and archbishops, were an endless succession of culinary wonders and of the choicest wines. They were frequently prolonged throughout the night for the better production of ballets, drama and music. Had Vitellius or Heliogabalus, Horace or Ovid. been able to take part in Leo's hospitality, they might have wondered at the costumes of the party, but otherwise would have found themselves quite in their accustomed atmosphere; for by this time Rome had very nearly forgotten that

Digitized by Google

she was supposed to be a Christian city. At the enthronement feast the poet Vitalis recited, unrebuked, a verse in which were these passages: "Jupiter (*i.e.* Leo) has descended upon Rome." "Leo Medici Apollo will heal all the evils of the time." On Good Friday, shortly after, the preacher of the day named him "Zeus." Christ he called "Decius," and, further in the discourse, "Curtius." The conservatorii of the time placed on the capitol a new tank thus inscribed: "We, oh Jupiter, have made the vessel, do thou fill it with thy gracious rain." The pope was habitually called Divus Optimus or Maximus, saints, but this was hardly a change, Dii or Deæ. A black bull was at Leo's death sacrificed in precisely the same way as was done in pagan times at Rome on an emperor's decease. In 1516 a plot by several cardinals to poison him, was discovered; he avenged it by ruthless use of the axe, and as this "evidenced" disaffection within the curia, he restrained malcontent by the illegal creation in a single day of thirty-one new cardinals. Other of his actions, to re-establish Medicean rule in Florence, his piratical seizure of Urbino, both merely secular, need not detain us.

On assuming the tiara he had promised not to continue the highly expensive erection of St. Peter's, but he broke this, as indeed most other vows or promises, which together with his insatiable ostentation caused an outlay that far outran even the enormous papal income; therefore Leo pushed with ever increased ardour the sale of indulgences. On All Saints' day, 1517, Luther raised his bold voice, the pope after a time excommunicated him; but papal universal supremacy was a thing of the past. Leo's exceedingly rapid, even sudden death on 1st December, 1521, was generally attributed to poison; all that can be said on this point is that the suspicion, though probably correct, is unproven. His next successor, Adrian VI.,

Digitized by Google

certainly fell a victim to such agency after little more than a year's pontificate. His determination to limit Vatican expenditure and to purify the lives of cardinals did not at all suit the views of the Sacred College.

The difficulties which Clement VIII., 1523—34, had to encounter were enormous. He was a bastard of that Giuliano dei Medici whom Sixtus IV. had murdered; but he increased rather than diminished his troubles, by wily deceits, for he was false to the core, and at the same time hesitating and timid. The two great powers, striving the one against the other, were Charles V., King of Spain and Emperor of Germany, and the French King, Francis I.

At first Clement thought his interest lay in favouring the former; but the great success at Pavia caused him to fear that he might be overwhelmed by the imperial power; he veered, advised the captured Francis to break his oath, released him from it, and concocted with sundry Italian rulers a league to aid the French King against Charles. His taxation and exactions in the Romish territories caused revolt, and he sued for protection to the ruler against whom he had been plotting, the revolt was subdued and Clement immediately returned to his old wiles. This brought down upon Rome the imperial troops under the Constable Bourbon (who betrayed Francis at Pavia). Rome was stormed and sacked (1527), and the pope, after a six months' captivity, was only released on payment of 20,000 ducats and a promise of no longer helping Francis. He, after this, was cowed into a more or less continuous subservience to Charles; he thus induced other difficulties by refusing Henry of England's desire for a divorce from Katherine (the emperor's aunt). He passed the rest of his pontificate in evading Charles' desire to amend, by means of a council, the Church, and in trying to persuade him to persecute those of his subjects who disapproved of its greed and corrup-

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Digitized by Google

tion. Clement respected by none, abhorred by nearly all, succeeded only in leaving on the Romish Church a deeper stain of fraud and cunning.

The history of all countries for many years after the first quarter of the 16th century is filled with war and massacre, the causes of which, as the reader will have gathered from preceding pages, had been accumulating for twelve centuries; marvellous is it that the storm so long threatening did not sooner burst. The reason of the delay can only be found in the dense superstition of people, which accepted almost unchallenged all assertions of the Romish Church. That with regard to the alleged transmission of special power through Peter has already been examined (Chapter I). Another claim, equally unfounded, is that through Romish clerics the nations received Christianity. The real fact with regard to the Goths and other invaders of Europe in the 4th century, is that they received the religion from Ulfilas, himself a Goth, who in Constantinople was of the Arian creed, translated the Gospel into the Gothic tongue, with coadjutors travelled about Europe and spread that faith. Ulfilas was never in Rome, which in that age had nothing to do with the spread of Christianity. The story of Gregory admiring some Saxon children in the slave-market at Rome, cherishing an idea of converting that nation and on becoming bishop, sending Augustin to carry out his purpose, is opposed to fact. He may have remarked the blonde beauty of Saxons, and he certainly sent Augustin. But Christianity was firmly planted in England long before that period. Gregory was pope from 590 to 604. Gildas, the first English historian, must have written his chief work about 550 (he died in 570). He says that England was converted to Christianity soon after Tiberius' time, he mentions the Diocletian persecution, and animadverts on Arianism. Lucius of Britain, about

Digitized by Google

A.D. 180, was the first king recorded to be a Christian. Baronius ascribes the conversion to St. Peter, Theodoret to St. Paul, Nicephorus to Joseph of Arimathœa. Whoever the immediate instrument may have been, it is certain that this country was Christian as early, or within a year or two as early, as any part of the world save Jerusalem and Antioch. Augustin came to convert England not to Christianity, but to papistry; the two objects being different, must be kept distinct.

The Goths, Vandals and other Teuton races flowing into Europe were continent and chaste, as Tacitus tells us. Purity, both male and female, especially the latter, was revered, women therefore held in honor. Greeks and Romans bred in "the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the vain-glory of life," (1 John II. 16) accustomed to the sensuous shows of the circus, greedy of physical emotion, by the laws of evolution inheritors of a carnal civilization already rotting, much of whose very religion was worship of bodily impurity, could not at once, few even tried to, correct the influence of their corrupted passions. Only on natures exceptionally earnest could the new religion act as antiseptic on the innate corruption, and after the first few years of enthusiastic reception the Italo-Byzantine clerics pursued the same course of life, thinly veiled in another garb, which their ancestors had followed, as described by St. Jerome and Marcellus. (Ch. III. IV. V.) Nor does history show that the heads of the Romish Church during the next thousand years amended in any way these evils, which, being then of longer descent, were but the more deeply rooted. The papal court, accepted by nations as the model of Christianity, set to every principality the most glaring example of depravity, engendering as far as its influence extended incalculable evil. Thus, as we have just seen, the spread of Christianity from

Digitized by Google

Rome is more than doubtful, that of corruption certain. The clerical envoys of papism to the people (monks and ordinaries) knew a great deal about the latter, little or nothing of the former (Chap. III.), and men can only guide in paths with which they are accquainted. This is bewailed in many passages of Dante's Divine Comedy, while some, but he dared not write in plain words, indicate his feeling that doubt of the Gospel Message can find no better support than that it should have fallen into the guilty hands of Rome. Already early Remonstrants, *e.g.* Abelard and Arnold, have been quoted. St. Bernard sighed for return to pristine purity. Cardinal Julian wrote to Eugene IV.: "The disorders and licentious conduct of the clergy excite in the people hatred of the whole sacerdotal order"... warns him that "unless these be amended, fresh defections would arise, for men will say that priests are incorrigible and will not be healed of their vices.... The whole blame for these troubles will be laid upon the priesthood as the sole cause of all the evil".... and he laments that blindness of "the curia which will not see the fire to which it is hastening." Examples of such cynical blindness may be quoted. At the Council of Constance were brought against John XXIII. seventy-three accusations of gross crimes, twenty being too heinous to mention; Martin V., appointed in his stead, had sworn to reform the Church; very soon after his enthronement he conferred upon this "monster" a considerable prelacy. Sylvius wrote scathingly on the venality of the Church; made cardinal, he combined with Roderigo Borja to sell every preferment he could get hold of; when he was Pius II., there were two candidates for the archbishopric of Nancy, the more flagitious of these was a certain Dietrich, but he agreed to pay double annates for the appointment, and therefore of course Pius sold it him. At the beginning of the 16th century Mac-

Digitized by Google

chiavelli wrote: We Italians have become wicked and irreligious, and for that we have to thank the Church and the priests." Cardinal Bellarmine's description of the state of religion at this time, or rather of what was called religion, as without discipline, morals or knowledge of Holy Writ, is given at length in Chap. XVI. An instructive sketch of sacerdotal manners may be quoted from Paul III.'s consilium on amending the Church. "In this city (Rome) wh*r*s walk about or they ride on mules as though they were honest matrons, and are at noonday followed up and down by the highest among the cardinals and by the clergy. We see no such corruption in any other city but in this, which should be an example to all the rest.... it is a filthy abuse and ought to be amended."

Another quotation from this report may be given: it names first, evidently considering it the origin and chief cause of all other evils, the arbitrary lawlessness of popes; and this, seeing it was addressed to the reigning potentate, in language as bold as would be safe. "First of all we think, most Blessed Father, that as in every other commonweath, so in the ecclesiastical government of the Church of Christ it should be esteemed the principal law of all, that law should be observed as much as possible and that it be not lawful to dispense with the laws but for a cause urgent and necessary.... their non-observance being pernicious. And one thing there is of moment next to this, or rather of even greater consequence as we think, that it is not lawful for the pope to make any gain to himself of the keys—of the power of the keys as we term it." When Caraffa became Paul IV. he did not at all abide by his own report, but, placing it on the index, forbade its perusal. The allegation that popes habitually broke the laws of the Church and made

Digitized by Google

pecuniary profit out of their fabled heritage of the keys, is not "protestant calumny," but the deliberate judgment of eight cardinals,—the most prominent members of that body. Their animadversions, confronted with Pius IX.'s infallible decree and Leo XIII.'s circulars, are of singular interest.

In the opening years of the 16th century indignation at priestly misconduct had reached a high degree—the indulgence system being but the festerhead of a corrupting sore. Paul felt that a council, for which Charles V. was pressing, could hardly be avoided; but he fenced with it as long as possible, sometimes approaching Francis, sometimes the emperor; he wanted a price for adhesion to either—viz., a large concession of territory for his bastard. At a meeting between him and the latter, near Parma, he demanded more than Charles would give,—cession to that nepot of the whole duchy of Milan. Failure here evidently brought nearer the inevitable council; but as dissent had spread also into Italy, he thought well to get rid of all opponents so near Rome, and sharpened there the claws of the "holy office," large numbers of people were burned and otherwise destroyed. At length, longer delay was impossible, and a meeting of a council at Trent was summoned for 1545. It was intended by Charles and the Protestants to result in termination of contention; it was so managed by the curia under guidance of the Jesuit general, Lainez, as to be a mere cabal of ultramontanes determined to prevent improvement of the Church. Only one of the many devices need be cited.* Trent had been fixed on as being accessible from Rome; each of the cardinals and bishops who went there took with him, under pretext of personal safety, a large guard, so that the town and neighbourhood were strongly garrisoned by papal

* The reader may be referred to Froude's essay.

Digitized by Google

soldiers. The Protestant leaders received from Rome a "safe conduct," which was so ambiguously worded as at once to betray an occult design. Remembering the fate of Huss and Jerome, they could not possibly venture into a place so entirely in hostile hands. While negotiations were proceeding, the papists met and hastily passed the very canons which were most obnoxious to Protestant thought,—that tradition is of higher authority than Scripture. When preliminaries had been so arranged that the Protestants considered they would be sufficiently protected at Trent, they requested that these resolutions should be reconsidered; the Tridentines peremptorily refused. Thus, if the Protestants joined the council, they would be assenting to propositions, denial of which largely formed the pith of their opposition. They could not possibly have anything to do, save by protest, with such an assembly. In spite, however, of having thus excluded "heretic" opinion, there was by no means unanimity of belief and feeling, and a council of any sort was by no means what Paul desired; he, after the tenth meeting, dissolved it, though but little of its proposed task was done. * There was at this synod, as at others, a great deal of talk and no action about reform, such had been the outcome at Pisa, Constance, Basel, Ferrara-Florence and the 5th Lateran; the Romish Church did not at all wish to be reformed. If money came in to support its debauchery and help it to seize other people's principalities wherewith to endow papal bastards, it troubled itself no further about the laity except to keep its pockets open. Prelacies were sold to such scions of nobility as would pay the most, and the same without the nobility for minor

* It is unnecessary to follow the doings of this packed committee of papists; it lasted with interruptions eighteen years: *i.e.* 1st period, 1545—7 with ten sittings; 2nd period, 1551—2 with six sittings; 3rd period, 1562—3 with nine sittings.

Digitized by Google

preferments; it did not in the least care whether or no the candidate were grossly ignorant, nor whether his conduct were or were not vile and abominable; it only insisted on the purchase money, and after that on the punctual transmission of the *decima decimarum*. The Tridentine, however, did furbish up the insistence on papal autocracy, and as dissent from this meant diminution of curial pickings, rancour against Protestantism and bloodthirst of the papists increased; hence the massacres of Amboise, of St. Bartholomew, the Thirty Years' war, and other horrors. The arithmetical reader will estimate the number killed in heathen persecutions as trifling when compared to the multitudes butchered in support of papal imperialism, which he will conclude to have produced more evil and misery than all other circumstances, events, and institutions combined in the whole records of history.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER VIII

PAGANISM REVIVED

What agreement hath a temple of God with idols?

THE preceding chapter shows that the upper stratum of Greco-Roman society inherited the luxurious and lascivious habits of their ancestors, and that when its members joined the Christian community they brought those proclivities with them. Although at first restrained by enthusiasm for the new doctrine of purity, yet as the excitation of novelty by degrees wore off, so did the impulse to obey closely Gospel tenets decline. Tertullian already, about 170, noticed, and a little later St. Jerome recorded this impairment, not only in conduct, but also in religious teaching and practice. In churches so gorgeously decorated as the latter writer described, plain, simple service was both incongruous and impossible, it therefore was complicated and overlaid with ornate additions and elaborate ceremonial, while pictures and images were added to the decorations of the buildings. The natives of the great centres surrounding the Mediterranean, as also the inflowing barbarians joining the new community, could not at once shake off their previous modes of thought nor change at a blow, as it were, their conceptions of tutelary protection by some personal entity between himself and the supreme God, whether called Jupiter or Odin. Such found prayer in the absence of a visible recipient impossible, it very

Digitized by Google

soon, therefore, was directed to the representations of saints and martyrs. Opposition to this tendency seemed to the Romish bishops a probable deterrent to conversion and also a very possible obstacle to their influence, they strove therefore to mould the practices of the Christian religion into forms most likely to attract the greatest number of converts, and these forms involved much that was characteristic of the Byzanto-Latin cult with some admixture of Egyptian and Jewish ritual—indeed by bishops of those early ages very little or nothing was invented, rather they borrowed, with but unimportant changes, precedent superstitions. This and the next chapter trace the more prominent of these adaptations.

SANCTI or DIVI. Besides the great gods there existed in heathen belief many lesser, divi or sancti, frequently named by classic writers. Tertullian after becoming a Christian wrote: "The heathens think that there is one supreme and absolute god and also a number of subsidiary ones, to whom they ascribe certain names and offices.... Most have the opinion of the great god that power is his alone and that he entrusts the exercise of his functions to the lesser deities, which is what Plato meant when he represented the great Jupiter in Heaven surrounded by a host of gods and daimons; as we pay honor to the emperor's officers, so also do we honor, so do we invoke the minor gods." Apuleius, a heathen novelist, says: "There are certain middle divinities between high heaven and this nether earth, by whom the prayers and merits of men are carried up to the gods and their favours down to us." Many more such might be quoted, but appear unnecessary. To these sancti, altars in the temples were dedicated, as also in the roads and streets, shrines before which lamps were perpetually burnt. Each divus was supposed especially favourable to the place where his shrine or temple

Digitized by Google

stood. Many were helpful in illness and childbirth, some took part in the affrays of men. People, however devout in the public worship of Jove, Ceres etc. preferred to offer in private petitions to their special saint.

SAINTS. The reverence paid by early Christians to martyrs and other heroes of their religion called holy—in Latin, *sanctus*—and the marks of simple respect, such as bowing in passing their tombs or memorial tablets, came by degrees more and more closely to resemble the devotional acts of the Gentile before his special saint. Indeed, after 312, many, led rather by the impulse of the time than by any assured conviction, having joined the new religion, continued with little or no change, but that of name, their wonted method of adoration. When pagan temples were taken over, the name of a Roman was exchanged for that of a Romish divus; the Pantheon (house of all the gods) became that of all the divi or saints. The conventicula, whether so adopted or newly built, were necessarily in districts known by the name of some pagan sanctus; the resultant confusion is noteworthy. The church in the district Sancti Dionysii became in the popular mouth, that of St. Dionysius, and this heathen deity soon became a saint of the Romish Church; so also with many more. The hagiology contains SS. Hippolytus, Hermes, Quirinus, etc. Another source of saints is certain qualities. The Cathedral in Constantinople was dedicated to wisdom (σοφια), and Sophia almost at once became a saint (Italian, Sta. Sapienza). To wisdom three constituents were assigned—faith, hope, and charity; these also blossomed into SS. Fede, Esperanza, and Carita. A handherchief fabled to have been impressed with a likeness of the Saviour's face was called Vera Icon (true image), which by facile anagram became Veronica. To name all instances of such adaptations would be unprofitable. There were, of course, mixed with these fancies

Digitized by Google

the names of many persons who had existed, a few but only very few of whose doings have some foundation in fact. The net result being that the Romish Olympus is crowded with a number of "subsidiary deities" having precisely the same office as Apuleius ascribes to "middle divinities." Saint-worship in the Romish Church is indistinguishable from that of the lesser gods in the pagan community, as Tertullian (200 A.D.) remarked: "And indeed I see no difference between the opinion they have of their saints and that which the Gentiles have of their divi."

PAGAN IMAGE WORSHIP. The classic Greeks and Romans, because they adored images, are called idolaters; the word is derived from the former language: εἴδωλον = an image, λατρεια = worship. But the Romans were not always so. Numa forbade the worship of any representation of god, man, or beast, yet about one hundred and seventy years after his death his regulations were changed, and the temples became filled with images of the gods.* Minucius Felix, about 220, derided this habit, pointing out that the bronze or stone, even when sculptured, is not holy until certain rites and gestures have been performed by men, who then think that their own antics have sanctified such material as the commonest utensils are made of. Tertullian laughed at the images placed at crossways and street corners with lamps perpetually burning in front of them.

ROMISH IDOLS. A large part of the Old Testament is a history of how the prophets struggled to prevent the Hebrews lapsing into image-worship. The early Christians firmly believed that the statues of gods were devices of Satan to delude mankind into idolatry; but about 170 A.D. desire for decoration of their sacred buildings caused the introduction of images and pictures which, as they

* T. Varro writing about 100 B.C. bewailed the prevalent image-worship as degrading and of evil influence.

Digitized by Google

represented saints, became the object of misdirected prayer. This in the Council of Elvira (306) was forbidden—"Placuit picturas in ecclesia esse non debere ne quod colitur et adoratur in parietibus depingatur." After Constantine's conversion many but half-converted people brought with them their previous habits and infected the whole community with the worship of idols. The word as thus used is strictly in accordance with St. Jerome's definition, "Idola intelligimus imagines mortuorum." The practice was highly profitable, more especially to monks, as the devotees of idols left, in receptacles at their feet, donations, but it was disliked by many, and this feeling appeared in Constantinople, where, in 712, the Emperor Philip removed a picture from St. Sophia's and ordered that at Rome similar objects should no longer hang in the churches. The pope disobeyed, and indeed ordered more pictures to be placed in St. Peter's. Thus began the iconoclastic strife. In 726 the Emperor Leo (Isaurian), feeling keenly the reproach of Jews and Saracens, that all places in the empire were more crowded with images and their perpetual lamps than even in the bloom-time of paganism, being, moreover, assured that these objects chiefly prevented conversion of those nations, determined to extirpate idolatry, and caused the removal from the churches of all pictures, save those of Christ on the Cross, and ordered a colossal statue of the Saviour to be taken down (730). Hence arose fatal riots and a civil war, beginning in the islands of the Archipelago and Asia, afterwards extending to Italy, for the popes Gregory II. and III. incited the people to tumults. Leo's next successor (Constantine) proceeded in the same sense and called an Œcumenical Council in 754 to discuss the subject. The three hundred and thirty-eight bishops concluded that it was Satan who had intruded idolatry into Christian worship. The next emperor, Leo IV., who succeeded his father in 775, also

Digitized by Google

disapproved image-worship, but he only reigned four and a half years, for his wife Irene, a poisoner as well as an idolater, killed him and soon after arranged for a council to meet in Constantinople; but in spite of deposing the Patriarch Paul and installing one of her palace-guard, Tarasius, she could not impose her will in that city, wherefore adjournment to Nicæa took place (2nd Nicæa, 787), and as all known to disfavour idolatry were excluded by soldiers, a large majority in its favour was secured as also condemnation of the former assembly. The adverse decrees were (815) repeated by another council in Constantinople, and these again by still another on 19th February, 842. In the Eastern Church this date is the "feast of orthodoxy." Further West idolatry was condemned by the successive monarchs Pepin, Charlemagne and Louis, this last by a synod in 825. Nevertheless, the insistance of popes has set this stigma on the Romish Church, though it would be difficult to imagine anything more false and at the same time weak as the Romish arguments in favour of this superstition. For instance, the Romish bishop (Adrian) wrote a letter, stating that images were worshipped in the earliest days of Christianity (manifestly untrue) and appealing to tradition in support of the following: "Images, both painted and sculptured, are proper to be placed in churches; homage and adoration (dulia and hyperdulia) should be offered to them, incense and candles burnt before them; for the adoration paid to the image is transferred to the original, and he who worships the image, worships that which it represents. Such is the doctrine of the Fathers and the tradition of the Catholic Church. We follow therefore the precepts of St. Paul in keeping the traditions which we have received. Those therefore who presume"—here follows the usual swearing. It can hardly be necessary to point out the falsity of all this. The

Digitized by Google

Apostles cannot possibly have taught by word of mouth one thing, thereby giving rise to a tradition, and in their epistles have condemned the very same thing. St. Paul, John and Peter all warn against idols.* St. John's exhortation is the last sentence in his letter, as though for impressiveness, "flee from idols." That adoration is transferred to its prototype is not an idea originating with Adrian, pagans thought in precisely the same way; no one supposed that the materials of which an image or picture was made, could aid him; but that the deity or sanctus they were fashioned to represent, might be induced to do so.

The decrees of the 2nd Nicene Council and of Adrian I. were opposed by many. Charlemagne summoned a council at Firmium and, a little later (794), another at Frankfort. Louis le Debonnaire called one at Paris (824—5). All these repudiated the 2nd Nicene Council; calling it with justice an assemblage of ruffians, they rejected the dicta favouring image-worship of Gregory II. As a refutation of the decisions arrived at by the last of the above councils, Adrian I. wrote a letter to Charlemagne, who in reply derided papal idolatry; but space can only be found for one phrase: "A limner makes two pictures of women; none would know which was meant for Venus, which for Mary, unless he signed them. When he has done so, one will be degraded and shunned, the other placed in honor and ye will worship it." Yet, through various fluctuations, the love of image-worship, by the middle of the 9th century, prevailed, and has since increased. Indeed, the doings of popes during the last fifty years have impressed an even deeper stain of idolatry on the Romish cult. The indulgences advertised by Pius IX. and Leo XIII. for persons who kiss the feet of a particular statue,

* 1 Cor. VIII. 4; 2 Cor. VI. 16; 2 Cor. X. 15; 1 John V. 21; 1 Peter IV. 21.

Digitized by Google

subscribe for a diadem to place on its head, or give a new frock to a doll in a box, are numerous. The idea that adoration passes from the image to the original is now obliterated, otherwise it would be held that to worship one picture of a virgin and child would be as efficacious as adoring another picture of the same persons; but in Romish idea nowadays, this is not so. The other world rewards are for those only, who kiss one particular image or "prodigiosa statua," which name clearly shows that not the person represented works the miracle, but the idol itself. A devotee may have in a church, close by, an image of a woman and child; but, being so taught, will travel hundreds of miles to worship another image of the same mother and her infant.

However, we will, as a sort of appendix, take some notice of the Council of Trent. At a discussion there on this subject, Catharinus, Bishop of Minorca, spoke thus: "It is most detestable that at this time there should be in churches and chapels pictures so lascivious that one may see plainly the most shameful parts of the body, which nature prompts to conceal. These are more fit to excite the carnal desires than the devotion of the most mortified flesh." A little after the close of this council (in 1564), the emperor Ferdinand was perturbed by the Tridentine decrees sanctioning idolatry, and wrote to George Witzel and to George Cassander, fervent catholics, on the subject; the latter sent this reply: "The matter is too obvious to need particular explanation. The worship of images and statues has come to great excess among us, and there has been too much pliancy in stooping to the inclinations, or rather to the superstitions, of the people; for now ours have come not short of the utmost excess of folly that the heathens fell into, whether in the making of images, the adorning them or in paying supreme worship to them." Since Cassander's

Digitized by Google

time this "utmost excess of folly" has been by the exertions of the last two popes considerably increased.

INSIGNIA OF DIVI OR SAINTS. The sculptors and painters of classic Rome desired that the figures they made should be identified as the gods represented. To ensure this they added certain signs, as a thunderbolt for Jove, a lute for Apollo and so on; without these "equipages" (Tertullian) the sanctus would not be known. When the Romish Church adopted pagan custom in the worship of images it resorted to the same device. St. John was distinguished by an eagle, St. Mark by a lion, St. Luke by an ox, etc. Even in such minutiæ did the deteriorated Romish religion copy the preceding heathenism. These equipages were afterwards supposed by the ignorant, both priest and lay, to have some connection with the biography of the divus, and formed the foundation of marvellous saint-myths.

PAGAN RELICS. Veneration of some article connected with the life-history of a departed predecessor, an offshoot of ancestor worship, is a prehistoric religion, inherited by more recent peoples. This is exemplified by the cult of the bones of Theseus at Athens, that of Romulus' lituus at Rome, etc. It was believed that these, or even that things which had been in contact with them, protected the bearer from evil influence or secured good luck. The ashes from altar fires, salt that had been sanctified, etc., placed in an amulet, were carried, hung round the neck, as also were pieces of metal moulded into certain mystic shapes.

ROMISH RELICS. Also in this matter did the Christians (after 150—170) adopt pagan custom; the material presence of something connected with a martyr, or indeed with any holy person, was held to be a safeguard against every sort of evil. These things were highly prized and priced; indeed, already, in the middle of the 3rd century, a very lucrative trade in relics was set up. Not difficult was it to practise upon people

Digitized by Google

eager to be duped, the catacombs were to these hawkers a fruitful field; many dreams pointed to where some part or the whole of an apostle or of a Jewish prophet would be found. No story was too far-fetched for acceptance, indeed the more extravagant ones gained the readier belief, the Church and the churches setting the example—Rome foremost, as will be seen immediately, and others rapidly following suit; for no fane or place of worship was held in repute unless it contained a bone, tooth or toe-nail of a martyr—real or mythic,—some hair from Noah's beard, or some of Abraham's luncheon, therefore the priest remained poor while perhaps his neighbour, having secured such rummage, would grow rich.

The story of Helena Augusta (Constantine's mother) finding the Cross is a "tradition," *i.e.* an unsupported myth. Eusebius (Life of Constantine, Lib. III. c. 52) describes the empress, while at Bethlehem, dedicating two churches to the Lord, also one on the Mount of Olives, and remaining evidently some time in the Holy Land; she was then about eighty, and soon after died there or in that neighbourhood. It is impossible that the historian should have recorded the building of churches and left a much more important event unnoticed. The tradition is that Helena was seeking the true Cross, which distinguished itself from two others by a miracle the preparedness of which is self-evident. She also is said to have brought to Europe the "true nails." The Cross was portable, as we know, by one man. In the Crucifixion three or at most four nails were used; since 320 there have been in the world as many fragments of the "true Cross" as would lade a goodly ship, and at least a hundred and fifty "true nails." The fabled possession of such objects as the chain of St. Peter, his bones (see p. 17), and the like has been of great pecuniary advantage to Rome. Louis IX. bought for a fabulous sum a twisted wreath

Digitized by Google

of bramble said to be the "true crown of thorns;" there are in various places enough fragments of such as would make a great many crowns. In various places there are heads, twelve in all, of St. John the Baptist; in forty other localities fragments of still other heads, and so many arms and parts of arms that he must have possessed at least fifty-eight fingers and about fifteen thumbs. Only one more much worshipped relic need here be mentioned—a smock-like garment in Trier, called "the holy coat." The chronicle concerning it runs thus. In 1196, the archbishop there was repairing and decorating the cathedral; in the course of the work some old chests were opened, and in one of them the smock was found, which at once began to perform miracles ("manifest indications"). It was shewn amid much rejoicing and then was put away for three hundred and sixteen years, when, in 1512, the Emperor Maximillian desired to see it. So much attention was attracted that the pope was asked to regulate the worship, since then it is exhibited and attracts huge donations every seven years. The story concerning it is that Helena brought it from Jerusalem, and in 320 (she died in 328) presented it to the cathedral in Trier. But Athanasius was banished thither from 336 to 338, and he expressly states that, while so resident, no church of any sort existed in that locality. Thus the empress is credited with giving this coat to a fane which did not exist till long after her death. Some less ancient forgeries may be mentioned. Pope Stephen III. (767—72) fabricated a letter from St. Peter to Pepin. A letter fabled to be written by Mary, during her life-time, to the people of Messina, is couched as though the wife of a carpenter were an empress, in the first person plural: "We accord." In 1839 Mastai Ferretti forced the circulation of a letter which he asserted had come direct two or three weeks previously from Jesus in Heaven. A few years later he having become

Digitized by Google

Pius IX., also vouched for another such, had it printed in golden letters and distributed, of course at a high price. It contains as an incentive to purchase plenary indulgence for those who kept it in their houses, also this violent deterrent of doubt: "All who murmur against this my holy letter, or say that it does not proceed from my sacred mouth, I will abandon them." Such things, being enacted in the 19th century, leave no place for astonishment at the superstitious credulities of earlier ages, nor for the pecuniary advantage drawn thence by popes.

MIRACLES OF PAGAN SANCTI. When the statue of a god was sanctified by lustral water, burning of incense etc., it was greatly venerated and credited with miraculous power. One of Pallas descended straight from Heaven to Troy. Ulysses and Diomed, by planning to remove, greatly angered it; baleful fires flashed from its eyes, it several times sprang upward and otherwise behaved unlike marble. The Juno of the Veii nodded and spoke; some statues have sung, many have wept, others have sweated; the images of Apollo and Mars have run with blood, Hercules and other sancti left their footprints on rocks, Minerva in broad daylight sent from Olympus to Numa a polished shield, Apollo in the voice of the oracle frequently prophesied.

SAINTLY MIRACLES. The images of the Romish Church inherited straight from their predecessors of the Pantheon the power of working similar miracles, nor was such whose statue or grave omitted such marvels held in much repute, which was a great disadvantage to its priest. It was therefore desirable that some thaumaturgies should be practised or at least reported. Partly to cultivate belief in these deeds, partly to relieve the dulness of convent life, a great many books of adventure have been written, some of these are simply grotesque, others nasty, all irrational. Certain of the stories are founded by ignorance on the "equi-

Digitized by Google

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

pages," some suggested by a name, the origin of which the monkish compiler was too ignorant to trace. Another source of sanctus-myth is that omnipresent lore from which many fairy-tales have come,—the weapons with which a saint was to be killed, breaking in the executioner's hands, are but the rods with which Graciosa was condemned to be whipt turning into feathers. In Venice is a fine picture by Tintoretto of this incident, not Graciosa but the divus. The picture of Mary, which Pope John went to meet in its descent from Heaven to Rome, is only a replica of Numa's shield. The more common source, whence the Acta and Flos Sanctorum as also the bollandists have plagiarised, are the deeds of Hebrew prophets, but these are a good deal vulgarized by tasteless additions; *e.g.*, Vitus and Crescentius are fed in the desert by animals, some saints pass dryshod through divided waters, others unscathed through fire, St. Copras in the evening delays the sunset, etc., etc. Furthermore, as to statues and pictures, there is in Rome so lachrymose a figure that it is called St. Maria del Piantu; one of Christ, which, before the sack of Rome by the Normans, wept so freely that the face had constantly to be wiped *con bombace*. The figures, especially of Mary, have in Italy and Spain become addicted to rolling their eyes and blinking. In 1864 a Mary image in the Ara Cæli church (if memory serve), took to this indecorous conduct; the number of votaries flocking to the church was enormous and so were the offerings; in consequence many other Marys were similarly affected, no less than twenty-six, and one crucifix behaved thus. In 1867 it was reported that a picture of the Virgin had winked at a gentleman in the nave; Pius IX. immediately advertised large indulgences to whomsoever would subscribe to a crown for it. In the sixteen hundred years since Pallas and Apollo ceased to perform miracles, their

Digitized by Google

descendants, the Romish divi, have learned by so lengthy an experience how to make them more profitable than the heathen did.

SACERDOTAL JUGGLERY. Probably no one doubts that the jumps, tears, flashing eyes and oracular voices of the classic images were due to priestly tricks. Nevertheless, it must be confessed that save some hollows and channels in colossal Egyptian images, no instrument of deception in ancient pagan gods has been found. The case stands differently with the miraculous images of the Romish Church. In England, at Bexley, was a large figure of Christ, which, when copper was offered, frowned, when silver, remained impassive, but smiled at gold. At the Reformation the mechanism of this pecuniary miracle was easily detected. When the Italians took possession of the Romish States the wires and springs of a blinking picture at Rimini were revealed. A bone of St. Anthony, very thaumaturgic in Geneva, was in the early years of the 16th century found by an anatomist to be that of a stag. We will not delay over this subject, but yet might draw attention to the jejune nature of these fictive miracles, and more especially to the abject condition of mind produced in nearly two thousand years by the Romish priesthood, who have taught their people to believe that the Great God would employ His Almight, like a mountebank at a fair, in causing manufactured figures to move their marble or painted eyes, in effecting the liquefaction of a thin red jelly, or other events so useless and trivial.

Before quitting the subject of images it should be noted that, in pagan times, to kiss the image or picture of a god was regarded as an act of veneration. So also did the worshippers of Baal. "Let him who sacrifices kiss the calves." The practice has been adopted by the Romish Church, pictures, images, caskets containing iron filings, bones, little chips of wood, etc. are

Digitized by Google

copiously bekissed. Pius IX. greatly favored the idea that osculation is worship, by granting many years' exemption from purgatory to whom should kiss certain pictures.

VIS MEDICATRIX SANCTORUM AND EX VOTOS. Some of the lesser, but more especially certain of the greater gods were very therapeutically gifted. Apollo, Pan and others had their specialities; a mysterious personage, the Bona Dea, was much appealed to, particularly in the troubles of maternity; but Minerva was the favourite, her temple at Nemi was the resort of the sick and deformed. A habit, the origin of which is untraceable, marks one method of appeal—viz., that of presenting to the statue a model of the trouble the saint was asked to cure; to this may be added a representation of some sort of danger, which the petitioner for protection expected to incur. At Nemi a large heap, previously regarded as a mere portion of a hill-side has, within the last twenty-five years, been found to consist of these gifts, models or drawings of carriages, distorted limbs, ships, etc. In the Museum at Pompeii are many picture-tablets representing statues of gods behung with, or having at their feet on the altar, a quantity of precisely similar objects which were called "ex votos."

THE CURATIVE POWERS OF ROMISH DIVI AND VOTIVE OFFERINGS. In the Romish calendar stand the names of many saints who are believed to have the will and power of curing disease; some, like Mary, are skilful in any form of malady, others are specialists. For instance, S. Anthony directs his attention to a certain inflammation of the skin. *Lux* (gen. *lucis*) is Latin for "light",—metaphorically "eye", and St. Lucia, a mythical personage, is addicted to curing ophthalmia. Many divi and divæ, which words may with propriety be translated gods and goddesses, are obstetric; this quality is in some countries ascribed to St. Anna—Mary's apocryphal mother, while in others her power in that

Digitized by Google

direction is but slightly esteemed. Relics, too, are supposed to be curative; at Braley priory was, while it still was monkish, a red girdle of Mary and a white one of the Magdalene, which were hired out to women. Mary's was the more expensive. A piece of St. Thomas's shirt hastened birth, a bottle containing some of Mary's milk assisted nursing mothers, the "holy bell" of St. Guthrac cured toothache, and so on *ad infinitum*. Credulity on one side and money-greed on the other are in these instances the motive power. Some of the saints are veterinary. In Saragossa St. Martin looks after domestic animals, all owners, including the archbishop, sent their livestock annually to make three times the tour of the church; of course the privilege had to be purchased of the priests, the tariff being half a real for each animal. In St. Erbot (Brittany), the saint of that name cures the mange and such like; a shelf on the rood screen is covered with filthy clippings of diseased hair, presented as "ex votos." The images in most Romish churches are behung with votive offerings, distorted limbs, ships, carriages etc.; they are like, but less carefully modelled than those found at Nemi or depicted in the Pompeian museum. Among these are tablets, sometimes pictured, often inscribed. In the columns below, those on the left are the antiques from that museum, those on the right from different Romish churches; save that the names of the gods and goddesses vary, there is no difference in the arrangements.

ROMAN.	ROMISH.
MERCURIO ET MINERVÆ DIIS TUTELLARIÆ	MARIÆ ET FRANCISCÆ TUTELLARIS MEI
NUMINI.	NUMINI.
MERCURII SACR.	DIVI GEORGII
HERCULI VICTORI POLLENTI POTENTI INVICTO	POLLENTIS POTENTIS INVICTI

Digitized by Google

PRÆSTITI JOVI.	DIVIS.
S. DIIS DIABUS QUE CUM JOVI	PRÆSTITIBUS JUVANTIBUS GEORGIO STEPHANOQUE CUM DEO OPT. MAX.

and one more out of the papal era

DIVÆ SAVINÆ ETC.
LIVIA EVPHEMIA IN
ACERBO STOMACHI
CROCIATO OPEM NACTA
V.S. MDXI

in which a lady, reputed Christian, thanks the "goddess Sabina" and others for relief from stomach-ache. Whether the tutelary numen or divus be called Sabina Mercury, Mary, Minerva in no way alters the essential heathenry involved.

PAGAN PRIESTS. Classic Rome swarmed with priests, the head being the pontiff (mentioned in the sequel); almost every sanctus had a set of sacerdoti—flamins, salii, luperci etc. A high position was held by augurs. Even as emperors were pontiffs, so also were they, as well as the higher magistrates, augurs, as shewn by several medals; these and certain chosen ones formed a consultative body called the "Sacred College."

ROMISH PRIESTS. The Romish Church is saturated with priests; the people being sedulously taught that nothing save by their intercession is granted to humanity. The head of these is the Pontifex Maximus clothed in imperial white; the Cardinals, next in grade, wear the scarlet of the ancient imperial court. They vary in number according to the exigencies, monetary and other, of the high priest. The office has often been sold (p. 109) for hard cash or influence. The distinction was once conferred for unnameable service on a young mountebank (Julius III. 1550). No pagan

Digitized by Google

pontiff ever shewed such flagrant contempt for his gods. After cardinals follow in rank the archbishops, bishops and a number of classified priests.

PAGAN AND ROMISH RELIGIOUS ORDERS. To each of the more reputed divi or saints of old heathenry a sodality was attached, such as Quirinals, Diales etc.; they lived in houses set apart, took certain vows and called each other brother or sister. Certain of these, especially the diales and vestals, were powerful and wealthy; the others were beggars, so harmful to the people that their mendicancy had to be limited to one order, and even that one to certain days, "as they impoverish families and teach superstition" (Cicero). Some contemporary primitive fathers and some heathen writers speak of them scathingly. St. Augustin described them as "roaming through the streets and roads, exacting from the people that on which they lived shamefully." Apuleius (The Golden Ass) speaks with equal contempt of their lazy greed. Writing in the 16th century, Polydore Virgil * described in two successive paragraphs the heathen and the Romish monks of his time. "There were among the ancients, companies of people who, under the pretext of religion, strolled from province to province, extorting money and other things; they carried with them images of their divi or saints, persuading the simple folk that they would be propitious to those that gave something and kissed the image. And there is at this time a set of cheats, enemies of work, the more inwardly depraved as they endeavour to show outward sanctity, perfect imitators of the goddess' priests, who, with fraudulent piety, calling themselves the servants of all the saints, fully trained to all sorts of imposture, go rambling about the towns and villages, begging of the simple countrymen; some for the building of a church,

* An Italian resident in England as bishop of Bath and Wells, a very learned antiquary.

Digitized by Google

some for clothes or food for the poor, others for the redemption of captives, some again for the bringing up of foundling children. By these means they get from one a sheep, from another wool, a lamb, from others a hen, eggs, bacon, and from another cheese or flax etc. And the better to deceive, they draw from a box something they say is the relic of a saint or an apostle's signature, or a letter worn out with age and dirty with much handling, and to whomsoever gives them something they offer these things to kiss, promising for their gifts eternal life." (Lib. VII. c. 6.) Ludovicus Vires asks: "What would St. Augustin say now could he see rich and opulent societies begging of those to whom they ought rather to give of that in which they abound and are gorged? (Comm. on St. Aug.) The parallel—not, be it noted, the present writer's—is fairly complete. Much has been boasted of the charity exercised at convent doors. Monks and nuns by unscrupulous use of canon law and other means (Chap. IV.), had absorbed landed property for miles round, had expropriated freeholders and, capturing almost all means of subsistence, reduced the people to poverty and to dependence on abbot or abbess; for this impoverishment an occasional dole of broken meat and unused loaves was not a high price.

The above quoted descriptions of monkish begging do not apply merely to a bygone age. The Contemporary Review, April 1900, depicts the doings of "The Sisters of the Good Shepherd." They receive, under the mask of charity, quite young girls, whom they terribly underfeed and overwork, never giving them a farthing wage nor teaching them anything beyond the needlework on which the nuns thrive; then when those unhappy ones are quite worn out, often purblind, from excessive work, they turn them out into the streets, usually of Paris, without a penny

Digitized by Google

(quite exceptionally a franc is given), either to starve or live a life of shame. The sodality, beginning with very small means, has by these methods become extremely rich, is laying land to land and building to building for the further increase of this terrible child-slavery. Yet in spite of their wealth they send certain of their number to beg in the streets "for the poor orphans," who never see a groat of the booty. M. de St. Genix, from whom the above is taken, adds: "The Romish Catholic Church has degenerated in France and become a blood-sucking vampire of a kind probably unmatched in history. It keeps tens of thousands in intellectual thraldom and material poverty that its ministers may wax fat." Here, however, issue must be joined, the facts denounced are not the result of degeneration, but have been the characteristics of the Romish Church since the beginning of the 5th century.

St. Theresa tried with little or no effect to amend the horrible immorality of convents. Alvarez Pelagio's and Clemangis' descriptions of them have already been quoted. In 1554 their condition was such that the committee of chosen cardinals on amendment of the Church, seeing that they were beyond remedy, advised their extinction. In Scotland nuns lived promiscuously with men and went about the streets with their paramours and bastards. In Germany the inmates of many convents were allowed to leave and lead lives of public shame, when tired they were, unquestioned and unrebuked, received back until a renewed attack of incontinence drove them into the streets again.

Neither in other ways are the occult doings of convents more worthy of trust. Pierre Marteau speaks of the dire punishments inflicted on nuns. As late as 1869 a newly made and unwilling nun was shut up in a very small, underground, dark, airless cavity and bricked up, all but a minute cranny through

Digitized by Google

which some bad and insufficient food was thrust to her twice a week. Thus she was kept for very nearly twenty years, when her brother's determined efforts obtained her release; she had lost power of speech and intellect. ("Martyrdom of an Empress.") All the trustworthy accounts of conventual doings prove how unsafe it is to exempt these places from state control and from unexpected sudden visits. France has, up to a certain point, discovered this. England will do so in time, and let it be hoped before such disasters as cannot be hushed up occur.

PRIESTLY TOILET ETC. The clothing of Romish priests, the alb, amict, stole, maniple are taken direct from those used in temple-worship. They not only are described by several heathen writers, but also are delineated on picture tablets in the Pompeian museum. The cowl of the begging heathen sodalities was used at first as a protection against weather, soon a resemblance to the veil of infants was noticed. St. Jerome and Apuleius, a Christian prelate and a heathen novelist, both comment on its use as an aid to deception by imparting to the mendicant's face an air of childlike simplicity. Twelve centuries later Cardinal Bellarmine wrote: "The cowl sets forth the infantile simplicity to which the monks desire to return." The phrase indicates the deceptive use; but, instead of desire, he should have said "pretend; for at that time monks were hawking about permission to commit every sin.

THE TONSURE, *i.e.*, shaving off the hair in a circular patch on the crown, was borrowed from Egypt (Anubis and Isis priests). The priests of the sun, the Phœnicians and Amalekites also were addicted to it; hence it was forbidden to those of Jehovah: "They shall not shave their heads in a round. (Levit. and Ezek.) No record exists of the period when Roman priests adopted the fashion; but in Pompeii are many picture

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Digitized by Google

tablets showing the bare patch. Priests of the Romish Church took straight from their predecessors of the temples this fashion, and as it is prohibited in the Old Testament and not mentioned in the New, it is of course ascribed to "tradition." It has been of practical value to clerics, saving many a one from a well-deserved whipping-post or hempen noose.

THE LITUUS. Romulus, divining from the flight of birds, also in tracing the outline of his projected city, used a short staff involuted at one end, thence it descended to the augurs and certain other priests; it was named a "lituus." When afterwards adopted into the Romish cult the handle was slightly lengthened, and it is called a "pastoral staff." *

CELIBACY. Of pagan orders many were vowed to celibacy, the vestals also to chastity; young ladies on entering the order, as nuns at the end of their novitiate, were obliged to have their hair cut off close to the scalp. Priests, both male and female, especially if dedicated to a diva reputed virgin, took the same engagement. Thence, although St. Peter and other apostles were married, the habit passed to Romish priests, after 180 A.D., yet was not then an enactment, for Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, wrote to a colleague wishing at that date to enforce it, and begged him "not to depart from Gospel teaching." Some Spanish bishops proposed at the 1st Nicene to make priestly celibacy compulsory, Paphnutius (unwed) opposed this; it was by a large majority rejected, yet married priests were held in some disesteem. It was Gregory VII. (1073—85) who, in spite of remonstrance from princes, peoples and clerics, forced celibacy on the clergy, of course appealing to tradition. His object was not to produce additional sacerdotal sanctity, but to prevent

* The mystic instrument seems to be of Babylonish origin, an appanage of priest-kings; one, as the writer has found, was carried by Assur Nasir Pal. 880 B.C.

Digitized by Google

priests from having civic and family interests which might clash with their obedience to him in his endeavours to make the Romish Church supreme over everything. His phrase was "The Church cannot be independent of lay influence unless priests be without wives." (Non liberari potest ecclesia a servitudi laicorum nisi liberentur clerici ab uxoribus.) This enforcement of celibacy—not, be it noted, chastity—helped greatly to produce among priests the most revolting impurity (Chapt. III.) and gross abuse of confession boxes (Chapt. XII.). Even as late as 1840, people continuing to protest against the intrusion of bachelor priests into the sacredness of their domesticity, addressed to Gregory XVI. a petition, signed also by many priests, for abrogation of this law; he refused, uncivilly calling wedlock "fœdissimus"; the unnatural rule therefore continues, and, like other survivals of heathenry in the Romish Church, is called a tradition and "sacrosanct."

PROCESSIONS. Many classic authors allude to processions made in honor of the gods and saints. Apuleius gives an excellent account of the "countless wax tapers and torches, seeming like stars fallen on the earth; the priests with tonsured heads carrying the relics of the omnipotent gods .... then one bearing the shrine, wherein are inclosed the holy mysteries, which include the sacred arcana of the magnificent religion." Along the route were prearranged spots at which the deity's image was lowered to the ground, where incense and lustral water were devoutly used, bowings and genuflexions performed. When the rightful number of perambulations were complete the devotees entered the sacred edifice, the tapers still burning, the music resounding; they marched round the temple, halting again at certain stations, again adored, incensed and lustrated the image and the arcana. When they had gone the

Digitized by Google

proper number of times around the building they bore the statue of the god to his appropriate altar, which, like all the others, was so placed that, in facing him, the worshippers had to look eastward. Then with more rites, incense and holy water the core and essence of the service was completed.

A peculiarity of the processions outside the holy building was an admixture of buffoonery—images of grotesque beasts opening gigantic mouths, Silenus swaying on the back of a bedizened donkey, Hercules in trouble with a drunken peasant, etc.; some of these devices, especially in the feasts of Pan, were frankly indecent, for to secure the continuance of large attendance amusement was deemed desirable. The streets along which the procession passed were decorated, windows and balconies behung with gay colored draperies; but to look down ("despicere" also means "despise") on the arcana or on the officiating priests was sternly forbidden.

After the 5th century the Romish Church borrowed direct from paganism these processions, to be made some on the anniversaries of events in the New Testament, some on the supposed or real dates of martyrdoms, some to celebrate occurrences in the apocryphal stories of Mary. Polydore Virgil may again be quoted. "The Romans and other nations made superstitious processions. From these doubtless is it that the custom among us is derived. For in the pomp of our processions it is usual to have some pleasantry go before, as files of soldiers, foot and horse, some figures also of ingenious construction for ridicule, such particularly as open a wide gaping mouth and make a clattering noise with their teeth; these are mixed with other diversions. The prophets are personated, one acts David, another Solomon, others are habited as Queens, artificial wings are tied to some children and they are made to sing. The

Digitized by Google

windows and balconies along which the procession passes are hung with carpets and brightly coloured brocades, and people are forbidden to look down from the buildings upon the mysteries." Accompanying the host (the reader may be reminded that this is the name of the pagan sacrifice) are banners, music, incense and the other items of an Apollo or Ceres procession. Virgil continuing, says: "Calixtus, or as some think Urban, did begin the embering days quarterly for the protection and amplification of fruits ordained for the sustenance of men and beasts," (this was the object of the Ceres processions). "Albeit, I rather take it to be imitation of the old Roman feasts which thrice in the year held sacrifices for the prosperous increase of their corn;—one, vinalia, for their wines; another, rubigalia, for all their grain lest it should be mildewed; a third, floralia, for their fruits." Other things the same learned prelate states to be derived direct from heathen worship,—for instance, "the banners that be hanged abroad and in the churches. The use of dancing, as Livy saith, came from the Horuscans to Rome, which we execute much on holidays as they did, not without slander to our religion and damage of character. As for masks, they be so devilish that no honesty can be pretended to color them. Zacharias, Bishop of Rome, made a decree against them, but this availeth nothing."

Thus a bishop of the Romish Church pointed out four centuries ago how the practices of paganry had invaded and overwhelmed Christianity, and this still goes on. Any person conversant with history, visiting Southern Europe and watching one of these performances, cannot but be struck, not by the resemblance, but by almost the identity with the old pagan rite; nothing save the fashioning (not even the hues) of the garments, the names of the images and banners, the introduction of a crucifix (also an eidolon) is changed.

Digitized by Google

In England the Jesuito-Ritualists practise just the same thing. It is true they have not yet introduced "masks that be so devilish," but they carry their images, pictures and sacred arcana, which, like the ancient gods of old, have their stations; they call them "stations of the Cross," they observe them in their outer and inner perambulations, in fact imitate as nearly as they can the old practices of heathen Rome and Egypt percolated through the papacy.

FLAGELLATION was brought to imperial Rome from Egypt, where some of the gods were placated by that procedure. The flogging was so severe as to draw blood, which the flagellant caught in his palms and, shouting invocations, held up to his deity. "You pour out your blood before your god, you invoke him by the gaping of your wounds. Who sees not that they who do these things are mad." (Min. Felix, A.D. 220.) The Romish Church, however, adopted also this insanity. "Those whom you see in the processions walking in order, with faces covered, their shoulders torn, while they scourge themselves with whips, like rueful penitents, have simply copied the ancient Romans, who, when they celebrated the feast called lupercalia, marched thus masked and naked through the streets, their shoulders lacerated with whips. And if we must go further to seek the origin of this verberation, I will affirm it to be derived from the Egyptians, who, as Herodotus tells us, used to sacrifice a cow to the great devil (Isis), and while the offering was burning beat themselves with rods" (Polyd. Virgil). In the Middle Ages, in periods of present or expected calamity, processions of flagellants were very common; even as late as 1820, one took place in Spain. This appears to have been the last example, for public exhibitions of the heathen absurdity have been repressed; yet the Romish Church has not lost faith in the scourge, it is still used in monasteries and convents

Digitized by Google

as also in many quasi Romish sisterhoods and brotherhoods, miscalled "Anglican."

LUSTRAL WATER. The Latin verb "lustrare" means "to cleanse," not only from outer impurity, but from inward stain. "Sea water or salt and water washes away the sins of men" (Pythagoras). Herodotus speaks frequently of its use, which seems to have prevailed among all peoples. To quote the many references by ancient writers would occupy endless pages. It formed a large part in the worship of ancient Rome and was thus prepared: a vessel containing water was brought close to the altar, the god invoked to sanctify it, and the same was done for some salt, which then was reverently mingled with the fluid, as also a few ashes from the altar fire; a torch, still burning, was plunged in, and the mixture stirred. The liquid then was holy, and was placed in aquiminaria or amulæ at the entrance of, and elsewhere in, the temple. An aspergillum (sprinkler) was provided, and the entering worshipper asperged himself; it was an insult to the god to approach his altar without this lustration; also during divine service the altars, the priests, the utensils etc., were much besprinkled.

Into the Romish service this was soon introduced; Platina says by Alexander I. (109—19). This is easily disproved, for more than fifty years after that bishop's death several fathers express the utmost horror of it. Justin Martyr wrote about 166: "It was invented by devils in imitation of the true baptism, that their votaries might also have their pretended baptism by water." Moreover, the Emperor Julian the Apostate, after the middle of the 4th century, ordered that all food brought to the market should be sprinkled with lustral water, that the Christians might either starve or eat of that they considered demoniacally polluted. This fluid must therefore have been an abomination to Christian idea at least as late as 363. The

Digitized by Google

probable date of its adoption is the last quarter of the 6th century.

ON SUNDAY IN THE SANCTUARY, THE SALT AND THE WATER BEING PREPARED, THE PRIEST HAVING SAID MASS,* OR ANOTHER IN HIS STEAD, WITH ALB OR SUPERPELLEX AND STOLE ABOUT HIS NECK, SAYS: "OUR HELP IS IN THE LORD. R. WHO MADE HEAVEN AND EARTH."

Then the incantation begins.

"I exorcise thee, Oh creature of salt, by the living ✝ God, by the true ✝ God, by the holy ✝ God, which by Elisha the prophet was ordered to be put into the water, that the barrenness thereof might be healed, that thou wouldst make this salt to be the salvation † of those who believe, that it may be for the healing of the souls and bodies of those receiving it, and may every spectre, and wickedness and wile of devilish fraud depart from that place in which it is sprinkled and every evil spirit abjured by Him, who shall come to judge the quick and the dead by fire."

These witch-like spells having rendered the solution what an Ashanti would call "good-medicine", it is placed in aquiminaria at the door, and elsewhere in the church, an aspergillum is supplied, and it would be thought an insult to the divus who gives his name to the building to enter it without moistening oneself more or less with the enchanted liquid.

INCENSE. To raise an odoriferous smoke, formed, even apparently in prehistoric times, a large part of magic rites, such fume being thought capable of

* This means a private one.

† The reader will probably notice that the Romish Church very rarely, if ever, teaches that Jesus is the salvation-bringer. A little further on he will see that in papal idea this is sometimes Mary, sometimes one or other saint, sometimes a bit of cloth worn between the shoulders, here it is a "creature of salt."

Digitized by Google

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

expelling injurious, and of placating beneficent spirits. Probably it is of eastern origin, the Egyptians and Jews deriving it from Assyria, whence it came to Europe. The old pagan cult of Rome employed it very largely. By the early Christians the ceremonial use of incense was regarded with extreme horror as being the visible sign of demon-worship, while the Gentile feared that omission to so honor his gods would entail their resentment, and result in calamity; this idea gave rise to some of the persecutions. During these periods refusal to burn incense, and that not even necessarily, before an image was a confession of Christianity, to throw into a brazier the smallest modicum of it was exculpation; but any one of the community doing this was regarded as a traitor to Christ—a "thurificatus" was expelled from the community, and only readmitted after a prolonged course of penitential discipline. The Bishop Marcellus of Rome confessed being bribed to perform this act; he was deposed. No record tells of the date when the Christian horror of incense was modified, it probably was a gradual process, beginning after Constantine's conversion, and motived by desire to attract as many Gentiles as possible within the fold; it seems that an earlier time for the complete adoption of the fumigant into the Church than the bishopric of Leo I. (440—461) is improbable. Romish tales and alleged decrees of earlier bishops are no more trustworthy on this matter than those concerning holy water.

We have seen that in primitive cults, savage, semi-civilized, magic or devotional, to raise a thick odoriferous fume formed a large part of the invocation. It is essentially a barbaric credence, therefore it is difficult to know what an archbishop of England, in a recent judgment, could mean by "the burning of incense conveys a beautiful symbolism." One would like to learn if this symbolism is the same as that of

Digitized by Google

classic Rome and whether it is identical with that of the Chinese joss-stick or of the Malay magician.

PURGATORY. Gregory the Great at the end of the sixth century was troubled by the still slow advance of Christian conversion; he found the love for and the adhesion to ancient superstitions a great impediment; this led him to make many concessions to ingrained habits or beliefs, and caused him to introduce much ceremonial and display into the pure rites arranged according to the Master's precepts by the apostles. Among other things, he adopted their ideas of a place intermediate between Hades and the Elysian Fields, where the immortal shade might be purged of the tarnish contracted by its long union with matter. The Æneid (Lib. VI. 736) describes this place, fire, however, is only one of the cleansers. The pagans were not sharp enough to make money out of it.

KISSING THE FOOT. The Roman emperor and pontifex Caligula decreed that subjects coming into his presence should kiss his foot. The order excited keen indignation; the optimi declaring that it was an insult to liberty and the introduction of Persian slavery. (Seneca.) The Romish pontifex who re-introduced, more than a thousand years afterwards, the pagan ignominy was Gregory VII.

A few more identifications of Romish habits with paganry can be little more than named. The eastward position, from sun-worshippers, came from Egypt to the Roman temples; the rosary is Buddhist; scapularies are borrowed from the classic setti. The designation "altar" instead of "sacred table," its primative name, the multiplication of such in one building, shrines and images in the streets and roads, perpetually burning tapers and lamps, are all direct from heathenism. The word "mass" is derived from the old classic method "Ite missa est," still used, of dismiss ng the congregation; the name of that said to be offered

Digitized by Google

or sacrificed, "the host," is the same as applied to the sacredly slaughtered animal, "the hostia," in the rites of Jove, Ceres, Venus etc.

The reader who will trouble himself to consult Polydore Virgil, Du Choul, Pierre Mussard, Conyers Middleton and others, will not be able to escape the conclusion that the Romish cult is but a plagiarism on the preceding paganism. Very little, save the names, and not always those, is altered.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER IX

MASS — TRANSUBSTANTIATION

This he did once for all by the sacrifice of Himself.

ROMAN CULT. The histories of very early Rome record that in its religious services neither images nor sacrifice of animals were permitted, but that the most acceptable offerings to the gods were cakes of fine wheaten flour (farre pium), called "the unbloody sacrifice." As the state waxed more wealthy more decoration of temples was introduced, including representation of gods to whom sacrifices were made. Lactantius, after conversion to Christianity (about 309), described the aspect of the temples. "The beauty of the gold, precious stones and ivory dazzles the eyes of the world, which believes that there can be no religion without these things. The people come to the temples of the god less for devotion than for gratifying the lust of their eyes, to stare at the brilliant metal, so that the whole worship of the gods is nothing more than what the covetousness of man desires." And about the sancti: "They dress that which requires no clothing with costly veils and with precious stones; they consecrate to these statues gold and silver, which are as much lost to the donor as to the recipient" (Div. Inst. Lib. VII. c. 7). Towards the gorgeous building marched processions of worshippers, the priests in vestments coloured partly in accord with their rank, partly with the festal day of

Digitized by Google

the particular sanctus. The participants, bearing banners, lighted tapers and torches, were accompanied by horn and flute players. Thus, and being careful not to let the lights go out, the procession with the image of the god entered the temple, each devotee sprinkling himself with holy water from the amulæ. Already in the sacred space, or arriving soon after, were other throngs, venerating a different Saint, * each filing away to the appropriate altar decorated with floral wreaths, the fire already burning. Each holy spot was attended by priests in alb, amict, stole etc., of hues varied as above, the minor functionaries in quieter colors. The position of the sacred image and altar necessitated an eastward position; the rites began with a confession by the officiating priests of their sins and shortcomings; nor must they approach the sanctified objects until they had washed their hands in a ewer presented by an acolyte. With the simpula a libation of wine and water, in which predominance of the former was essential, being poured on the altar, the chief priest approached it, accompanied by the "thurifer," as depicted in many Pompeiian tablets; the censer was swung as he threw also incense on the fire, asperged with lustral water the altar, the attendant priests and laity, who also had confessed. Thus all was purified and fitted for the great rites. Though the congregation kept their faces in the eastward position, the priests at certain points of the service turned themselves about (et sunt vertigines a Numa instituta), and in certain of these movements placed a hand on the mouth, symbolizing that what was whispered to the god was too sacrosanct for lay ears. All bowed at each enunciation of the holy name, the flamins and diales, holding the

* Decoration of, and burning incense on, the many altars are mentioned in the Æneid. The grandeur of the cult is well described by Apuleius.

Digitized by Google

lituus vertically, leading the responses. The prayers finished, more lustral water was scattered, more incense cast upon the fire, amid the smoke of which the victim brought to the altar lustrated and befumed was slaughtered. The divine service culminated when the chiefest priest present lifted high some severed part, or the whole if small; it was called the host (hostia), at which all present devoutly bowed the knee. After some minor ceremonies, and inspection of the viscera by the augurs, one of the priests stood forth and dismissed the congregation by loudly saying "Ite missa est."

THE PONTIFEX. Of this holy personage Dionysius of Halicarnassus writes thus: "He has a sovereign control in all the most weighty affairs, judging all cases relating to sacred things, as also those between private individuals. He enacts new laws on his own authority in causes for which those in being do not provide." He was the central magnificent figure in the religious services that took place on specially sacred days and in certain years—as, for instance, those in which the ludes seculares fell, when processions were more magnificent and frequent, rites more gorgeous, priestly vestment more brilliant, and even larger crowds were roused to more fervid excitement. The higher priests carried the arcana, lesser ones the pictured banners of the god, others, as also nearly all of the laity, torches and candles. In a gilded ivory carrying-chair came the Pontifex Maximus (who as a rule was also Emperor), either holding altogether aloof from the procession, or, quitting it when near the consecrated edifice to enter at the holy doors, remaining unrevealed behind the curtains of his sanctuary, while the lesser priests in gorgeous vestments, certain military guards and the laity, though the building was belit by day, flooded the temple with the more sacred light of their many tapers. The varied notes of instruments, mingling

Digitized by Google

with well-attuned voices, disposed the mind to solemn joy. Soon resounded a more triumphant clangour of the trumpets, the procession of the higher priests marched in, their amicts, stoles etc. varied in hue, according to their rank, to the special day of the divus or saint whose festival they were celebrating. At length in his sedia gestatoria the Pontiff is borne in shoulder-high; he is surrounded by members of the Sacred College and of the Senate, by civil magistrates, officers of the household and many priests. In front is borne, unsheathed, the sword of state, emblem of imperialism. He is garbed in white, "of all hues the most pleasing to the gods" (Cic. de leg.), richly decked with golden plates and many jewels. Around and above his head are waved, on long thin stems, ostrich and peacock feathers (flabelli). As the procession marches through the sacred edifice, bearing thousands of tapers and torches, and accompanied by rich bursts of song, the worshippers clap their hands, shouting vivats and glorias. In most of the ceremonies doves and other birds are let loose. Then on a given signal all is hushed, the grand service with the smoke of incense, the spray of holy water, begins. His portable chair being lowered from the bearers' shoulders, the Pontiff, with the lituus-bearing augurs, other priests and thurifers, approaches the high altar, deeply bowing. Yet even he is obliged to confess, to wash his hands, to be lustrated with the holy water, and incensed. The victim, the species varying with the god, falls to the axe; the end of the prolonged ceremony being announced, as above mentioned, by "Ite missa est."

Public worship did not, however, constitute the whole religious life of classic Rome; in the markets, streets and roads, shrines containing a saint were erected, before them the passer bowed, the images were kissed, their lamps kept carefully tended. Besides, each

Digitized by Google

pious man had in the house images of his tutelary divus, to whom he offered petitions and adorations, before whom he burnt a perpetual lamp and placed an offering of salt and holy meal.

ROMISH CULT. In Rome, during the early days of Christianity, each conventiculum or church contained one sacred table for celebration of the memorial rite, it was not, however, a sacrifice—of which Christ declared he would have none (Matt. IX. 13: XII. 7). Altars are therefore disobedient importations. Later, Romish churches became filled with altars, one for each of several Marys and for a number of differently named divi. As the conventicula assumed (as already described, p. 57) a magnificence, imitated direct from heathen temples, so was it necessary to adorn with flowers, jewels and burnished metals the altars, lest they, in such brilliant surroundings, should appear mean and inconspicuous. To perform before such gorgeous decoration a service like that which Acts tells us was used by the apostles, would have been utterly incongruous, and quite uncongenial to the barbarian and Roman pagans whom the Church was anxious to attract; and, furthermore, the image to whom this ornamentation was dedicated must also perforce be decked with silk, lace and jewels, real or sham, but always brilliant, and likewise must everlastingly have its lamp. Persons addicted to asking favors of such an image, or of that which it represents, can at most times enter the building and make invocation, and, if any special intervention be desired, bring and leave at the altar a lighted candle, a bunch of flowers or perhaps a rude model of some deformity. At times, in certain seasons frequently in each day, a ceremony before the altar is performed by priests dressed in alb, amict, stole, etc.,* coloured to denote their rank and also the particular sanctus of

* For processions preceding the actual cult, see p. 147.

Digitized by Google

the day, his image being often garbed in a like color. The devotees gather around the altar, upon which, as on those of Venus or Ceres, many tapers are burning. There the worshippers who have favors to ask of their tutelary sanctus or sancta, also bring lighted candles to be left there, though there is no reason to suppose, save tradition direct from paganry, that the flame of a taper gives any particular pleasure to those supposed to dwell in the effulgence of God's throne. The service, enlivened by the grandiose notes of the organ, is in a language not understood by the hearers,* an acolyte's bell being the signal for kneeling or standing. The audience, during the greater part of the ceremony, see only the hinder parts of the priest's garments, for, like his predecessors in Persia, Egypt and classic Rome, he faces the direction of sunrise, towards which he confesses his sins and shortcomings; nor must he touch the sacred objects until he has washed his hands in a ewer brought by an acolyte or thurifer. At Easter it was, and still in many places is customary to pour libations on the altar, "taking care that there be more wine than water, otherwise the whole mystery would be spoiled" (Durand, Bishop of Meaux, 1270). Then the service proper begins; at times the priest faces the people; but chiefly eastward, for during the ceremony he is continually gyrating after the manner instituted by Numa (p. 157). Sometimes reading from his book aloud, at other times whispering in a low voice certain phrases, such as "Do this in memory of me," which it is thought disadvantageous that the people should hear. He frequently also changes his adornment, uttering a prescribed prayer as he dons or doffs this

* In the British Isles and North America, the laity are permitted to have a mass-book in a comprehensible tongue, not so in countries exclusively Romish. Popes have threatened and inflicted severe penalties on those who have translated it.

Digitized by Google

or the other garment. All this while the censer is swaying—the priest, the image, the altar, missal, even the elements are bereeked, as too is the congregation. All are also sprinkled with lustral water. The gesticulations and facial contortions of the priest, kissing the altar and the missal, more or less deep bows, signs of the Cross, lighting and extinguishing some of the candles, and other trivialities, are all rigidly prescribed. The culmination is lifting on high the hostia, as after a certain phase of the ceremony the wafer is called. In order to avoid any appearance of disrespect towards that which we hold in the highest reverence, the description may omit other actions, except the close, announced to the congregation by the words, "Ite missa est," from the central one of which the Romish usage takes its name. They are the same as were used many centuries before the Christian era, in the temples of old Rome.

There are a great many masses, high, low, wet, dry public, private, etc., as well as those paid for by way of "suffragia," to release souls from that place so very profitable to Romish pockets, called Purgatory. The elaboration of meticulous details in these performances is tremendous. The following is the rubric for one mass.

NUMBER OF GESTURES DECREED FOR ONE MASS.

For folding and unfolding hands	65
For making sign of the Cross over objects and persons	58
Kneeling	44
Deep bows	37
Slight bows	9
Incensing altar, books, host, etc.	53
Kissing same	29
Proper use of eyes	17
Washing and wiping hands and fingers	6
Beating the breast	5
Tinkling the bells	4
Lighting and extinguishing candles	3
Total of choregraphic directions	330

Digitized by Google

These gestures form part of a low mass with twenty-six sections, but on the days of this or that Romish god or goddess, of which there are very many in the calendar, other ceremonies are added; the extras on the first Sunday in Advent are twenty-eight. After two hymns comes a prayer to the Virgin, who in Romish celebrations takes precedence of the Almighty, then one for the Church and one for the pope. At the end are three more to and for the same persons, each being twice repeated, makes a total of eighteen, and there are besides ten others. The whole is never to occupy more than an hour; but is generally completed in half that time, *i.e.* about half a minute for each item. But the whole three hundred and seventy-five are not unfrequently rushed through in a quarter of an hour. St. Liguori ruled thus, "Any priest who finishes mass in less time than a quarter of an hour, cannot be exonerated from mortal sin, because in so short a time he cannot celebrate without great corruption of words and ceremony, or at least indecency." In a just preceding phrase he says of officiating priests, "their bowings and their genuflexions are so performed as to manifest contempt rather than veneration." Many persons accustomed to the reverence observed in Protestant churches, have felt, when visiting countries exclusively Romish, what St. Liguori expresses.

On certain occasions—Christmas and Easter, for instance, and recurring more frequently in the years of ludes seculares (jubilee)—the Pontifex Maximus, considering himself for the moment an unjustly dethroned emperor, takes a great lead in more showy ceremonies. At those times all Rome – residents, pilgrims, sight-seers, foreign bishops—crowd the city, gathering from early morning in all approaches to the theatre of display. St. Peter's is fitted with benches and rout-chairs, numbered tickets giving admission to the best stalls or boxes; when these have been filled the

Digitized by Google

populace is admitted to the surrounding area. The long interval between filling the auditorium and the opening scene of the spectacle is wiled away by society talk in unsubdued tones, greetings by gesture across the area, making assignations, or seeking omens for the next lottery. The church is for certain of these occasions additionally decorated; for some the windows are shuttered, thousands of tapers around the altars or suspended from the columns being credited with affording a light more pious than that of the sun, which in other pageants is allowed to enter, dulling, but not superseding the light of tapers. Also on some occasions the columns are draped in colours of some symbolism, the statue of St. Peter is diademed and dressed in amict, stole and ornaments, which in his day were distinctive of pagan priests. To avoid repetition the reader may be requested to refer back to pp. 158-9, for the spectacle displayed in St. Peter's is identical with that described as taking place in the Pantheon; there is the same entry of military and sacerdotals with music and applause, accompanying the Pontifex Maximus in the magnificent sedia gestatoria, preceded by the emblem of imperialism, the state sword, befanned by ostrich and peacock feathers, mounted on long thin stems (flabelli), the same incensing, lustral water, halt and descent from the chair at the high altar. No animal, it is true, is slaughtered, but birds are, as of old, let loose, and the memorial service is changed into a sacrifice—an immolation, which very word is derived from "mola," the name of loaves decreed by Numa to be offered to Jupiter, Ceres, etc. After terminating these functions, the high priest, resuming his seat in the sedia gestatoria, amid the waving of handkerchiefs, the shouts of "Viva Leo il Papa re" and hand-clapping, the procession is reformed and the Pontifex Maximus returns to his soup in the vestiary. Meantime, as soon as the excitement allows him to be

Digitized by Google

heard, a cardinal advances and discharges the throng with the classic, "Ite missa est."

TRANSUBSTANTIATION. The sect (hairesis) of the Pharisees constituted in Jerusalem an all-powerful hierarchy which established minute observances, the right interpretation of which they declared could only be determined by them, while their strict fulfilment was necessary to salvation. By this means they were able to thrust themselves as a barrier between mankind and God, exacting dues and gifts, *i.e.*, "grinding the faces of the poor." Hardly do we find in the words of Christ a single harsh phrase directed against other than this "generation of vipers." The task which He committed to His disciples by no means connotes the re-establishment of another hierarchy again exacting huge doles by claiming that only through it is the Mercy Seat accessible, that Heavenly goodness is only granted to their venal prayers, and that they and they alone have power to forgive sin.*

Among other rites, that of the memorial Supper was used as a means of obtaining power by changing it into a miraculous performance only to be accomplished by Romish priests. That it was, by the apostles and by the uncorrupted primitive Church, regarded as commemorative and also as thanks-offering is plain by the names applied to it:- εὐχαριστια = thankfulness, ἀναμνησις = memorial, τυπος—ἀντιτυπος = type, antitype, συμβολα = symbol, εἰκων = image, likeness,

* These words, especially "venal," must be justified. The dictum of the Romish Church is "The mercy of God can only be obtained by the prayers of priests." These prayers were and are sold for money. After confession in the earlier days the priestly formula was "May God forgive thee." Since the twelfth century the priests say: "I forgive thee." In the Latin the former runs: "Deus te absolvat," the latter: "Ego te absolvo." To circumstantiate this assumption, another Romish dictum asserts: "So great is the power of the priest that God himself is subject to his decisions." These sacerdotal pardons are sold for money.

Digitized by Google

εὐλογια = praise; all words denoting gratitude and praise for bestowal of the antitype or symbol. St. Paul (Hebr. IX. 9) uses another word, θυσια = sacrifice; it occurs thus, δια της θυσιας αὐτου, a form which entirely excludes any renewed sacrifice of Himself, an idea which would have to be expressed by δια της θυσιας της εαυτου.

A sentence used by Jesus in distributing the bread: "This is my body," has been to many a stumbling block, yet the matter is simple. Centuries ago Ribera said: "Pervulgatum est in scriptura ut res figurata nomen habeat figuræ." (It is very common in Scripture that what represents something should receive the name of that which it represents.) Jeremy Taylor (1661) put the same remark in somewhat longer form: "In the language that our Lord spoke there is no word meaning to figure or represent, but they use the word 'is.'" "The Hebrews and Syrians always join the name of the signs with that of the things signified, and as it is the very essence of a sign to signify, it is not an improper elegancy to use in those languages 'est' for 'significat.' It is usual in the Old Testament to understand (*i.e.* omit) 'est' when the meaning is for the present; but when for the future, then to express it. There are in the Old Testament many instances of this construction. Joseph said: 'the seven good kine seven years and the seven good ears seven years,' without any connecting verb. 'This my body' in the aramaic means is a sign of or represents, in exactly the same way as the seven kine and the wheat ears represent years." There are in St. John's Gospel many similar phrases: "I am the vine,".... "I am the door,"... "I am the way." It would be as reasonable to suppose that He desired his disciples at the time or in after ages to consider Him a tree, a highway or a specimen of joinery as to imagine that He wished them to take Him for a piece of bread or

Digitized by Google

a piece of bread for Him. Thus wrote the very early fathers: "The bread being taken and distributed to His disciples, Christ made it His body, that is the figure of His body." (Tertul. advers. Marcon.) "The bread of the Eucharist is a figure (εἰκων), which Christ commanded us to do in remembrance of His passion." (Just. Mart. cont. Tryph.) "The bread and the cup are the images (εἰκων) of the body and blood of Christ, that bread which is sanctified by the Word of God so far as it belongs to the matter or substance of it, goes into the belly and is cast away in the secession, which to affirm of the natural or glorified body of Christ were greatly blasphemous; therefore the body of Christ which communicants receive is not the body in a natural, but in a spiritual sense." (Origen dial. cont. Marc.) Nevertheless, in the latter part of the 2nd century, the populace began to attribute magical powers, a sort of protective influence to the elements, morsels of the bread were carried in amulets and hung round the neck, were placed in contact with the body of those sick unto death, and, like Charon's ferry money, inserted between the lips of the dead.* The Church, though not condemning these superstitions, did not formally accept them; the mendicant monks in their wanderings encouraged them, for they were profitable. Slowly but surely, however, popular credence was adopted by the Church which, worldly-wise, panders to superstitious practices, lest, in teaching better things, it should jeopardize its imperial ambitions by losing favour with the multitude. The capability ascribed exclusively to Romish priests of performing a stupendous miracle necessary to salvation trends self-evidently in that direction; the final definition of that alleged miracle was not for-

* About this time pieces of metal, cut into the shape of a cross, were carried with a like object; a manual gesture in that form was considered potent against demoniac influences.

Digitized by Google

mulated till the Council of Trent (1545—63); between the 2nd century and that meeting were many ordinances incompatible with and destructive of each other, although the Romish Church affirms, untruthfully, that its dogmas concerning the Holy Supper have always been the same.

In instituting the rite, Jesus said of the bread "This my body," of the wine "This my blood;" the distinction between the solid and fluid parts of His earthly personality was maintained in the Romish Church for more than a thousand years. About the end of the 3rd century many laymen manifested objection to take the wine.* Others took it by dipping into it the bread. While prohibiting these usages, the Church clearly stated that the elements represented—the one the Body, the other the Blood. "It is an ordinance of God and an apostolic behest that the bread and the wine should both be given separately to the laity." (Julius I. 336—52.) "Those who receive the body, but not the blood of Jesus Christ, shall be expelled from the community." (Leo I. 446.) Later were condemned "those who take the bread only and not the wine, as persons who cherish superstition; either they shall receive both forms, or shall be refused both, because one and the same mystery cannot be divided without sacrilege." (Gelasius 492.) "None shall be admitted to the altar, unless they take both the bread and the wine." (Urban II. 1094.) A letter from Paschal II. (1118) to Pontius, Bishop of Cluny, enforces two-fold acceptation and exhorts that prelate "not to permit any departure to be made, through a novel and human institution, from that which Christ the Master ordained and did." Innocent III.

* This may in some have been motived by fear of spilling, for we know that many entered the churches drunk; but others, especially Jewish converts, were actuated by the Hebrew command not to eat the blood. (Gen. IX. 4: Lev. XIX. 26, etc.)

Digitized by Google

decreed (4th Lateran, 1215), as a dogma necessary to salvation, "That the bread is transubstantiated into the Body of Jesus Christ and the wine into His Blood."

The Council of Constance (1414—18) reversed the decrees of these six infallible popes, by ordering that at the Eucharist the laity should receive the bread only, thus withholding participation in the benefits of His Blood, which those believing John, Peter and Paul considered an essential of the rite; thus, also, changing the decrees of Christ, * also the directions and example of the apostles, and this without fresh revelation from on High and without even a pretence of tradition. It is impossible that an oral (not written) apostolic precept, such as the Romish Church calls a tradition, should have been left occult for nearly fourteen hundred years, unknown even to popes, and then after all that time exhumed from nowhere in particular, apparently with the object, for no other is conceivable, of saving trouble to the priests and enabling them to despatch mass with the greater celerity.

The introduction as above of the word "transubtantiated" leads inevitably to some history of its adoption by the Romish Church. Chapter II. relates, that after the middle of the 2nd century, every point in the mystery of the Incarnation was the subject of argument or quarrel, and the precise condition of the elements after consecration could hardly escape this fate; the parties in the disputation soon became divided into those who, with Justin, Origen and others, regarded these materials as symbolic, and those who considered that a metabolic change took place. In 831 (about) Radbertus, a Benedictine of Corbie, composed his work "De Corpore et Sanguine Christi," affirming a material change, this at once produced a refutation by Ratramnus, another monk of the same place;

* "Drink ye all of this."

Digitized by Google

but the most trenchant and intellectual opponent of this theory was, about two hundred years later, Berengarius of Tours. The idea of transubstantiation, however, suited the mystic and superstitious temper of the people; the status of priests, too, was enhanced by ascription to them of a stupendous miraculous power. Berengarius was reputed heretic, and was summoned to Rome (Nicholas II. 1059), where seeing that his life was endangered, he recanted, but repented of his weakness and, having returned to Tours, again refuted transubtantiation. He was summoned once more (1078) by Gregory VII., who, himself no believer in transubstantiation,* protected him as far as he dared, but the fanaticism of monks, lower clergy, and people forced him to induce Berengarius again to retract, though he forbade anyone to call him heretic. But the academician of Tours again revoked this retractation, and remained during the rest of his life opposed to that thaumaturgic supposition.

Thus, in the primitive Church, the fathers considered and affirmed that the consecrated elements were a figure or a sign; between this era (about 196—200) and the latter half of the 16th century at least six popes, including Innocent III., without either denying or affirming a figurative quality of the elements, pronounced in plain words the bread to be or to signify the body, the wine, the blood of Christ. On 11th October (1551) the Council of Trent declared (Sess XIII. cap. IV.) "that by the consecration of the bread and of the wine a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the body of Christ our Lord, and the whole substance of the wine into His blood, which conversion is, by the holy Catholic Church suitably and properly called transubstantiation." This is a plain description, but there follows Canon III.: "If any one denieth that in the venerable sacrament

* His conduct towards Berengarius shows this.

Digitized by Google

of the Eucharist, the whole Christ is contained under each species, and under every part of each species, when separated, let him be anathema." Thus the council declared in one breath that the *whole* of the wine becomes blood, and in the next that it at the same instant becomes a great many other things, assertions mutually destructive of each other; and the same with the bread. Canon VIII. runs thus: "If any one saith that Christ given in the Eucharist is eaten spiritually only, and not also sacramentally * and really, let him be anathema." The Romish Church thus curses those early fathers (p. 167) whom it professes to venerate, and on whose writings it pretends to found in great part its interpretation of Holy Scripture. Chapter III. of that same session says of Christ that "he hath now risen from the dead to die no more," and yet papists assert that many thousand times every day in the year He is killed, and by countless mouths is chewed *(manducare)*, "which to affirm is (according to Origen) greatly blasphemous."

There are in the chapters and canons of the Tridentine a great many more inextricable networks of inconsistent phraseology, which lest they prove wearisome will not be here detailed. Their cause is that at Trent the prelates quarrelled violently nearly all the time, yet, anxious to have done with the business, patched up formulæ which seemed to mean what one party could accept, and then enunciated others conciliating the contrary views of various opponents. Their chief preoccupation being to produce such dogmas as should run counter to those of Reformers. Moreover, the Tridentine affirms that transubstantiation was always believed in the Church—a manifest untruth, as perusal

* According to definitions of the uncorrupted early Church, a sacrament is the sign or figure of holy things *(sacrum signum.* Origen.) not a holy entity itself; these two adjectives applied to the elements are therefore mutually antagonistic.

Digitized by Google

of early fathers as of those above quoted, and even of Romish teaching previous to the 12th century, plainly shews.

Perversion of the Last Supper into an elaborate imitation of classic temple-worship with a crowd of lesser gods or saints, pictures and images, lustral water, incense, burning tapers, perpetual lamps etc., might be described at indefinite length, but it is undesirable so to insist on certain developments as to wound the susceptibilities of many persons. Nor would the writer wish to put down a word that could be, by a forced construction, interpreted into irreverence towards (not the mass), but that Christian service of praise and thanksgiving instituted by Jesus.

Digitized by Google

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER X

MARIOLATRY

They shall turn away their ears from the truth and shall be turned into fables.

THE QUEEN OF HEAVEN. Rhea or Galli was one of the most revered sanctæ of Roman paganry. Although spoken of as the mother of the gods Jupiter, Neptune, Ceres etc.; yet is she ever virgin. Her exact relationship to the greater gods is somewhat differently told by different classic poets and by mythologists. Often with bated breath she is spoken of as "Bona Dea." Probably she is fundamentally the same personage who all round the Mediterranean basin was adored under different names; the various nations in that district having an ineradicable impulse to worship of the feminine—Astroarche (Accadian), Mylitta (Persian), Melechet (Hebrew) and so on. Under this last name she was a sore temptation to the Jews. Jeremiah reproved those who had wandered into Egypt for burning incense to the Queen of Heaven, their reply being that their fathers and kings and princes in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem had so burnt incense. In the Italo-Byzantine cult she also took a name from her dwelling-place, Heaven, and at the same time was frequently confounded with the goddess of love (Urania-Aphrodite). Homer describes her as "Gold-enthroned and crowned with stars" (Iliad, 41). Juvenal also speaks of her (Satyr. VI). Of pregnant and parturient women she

Digitized by Google

is the great protectoress; those, invoking her aid, offered to her incense, wax tapers and "ex votos," and in such circumstances Lucina was usually affixed to her name. Thus as Rhea she is mother of the gods, in other phases Aphrodite, but always, in spite of abundant maternity, the "Ever-virgin Queen of Heaven," "Star of the Sea" with her diadem of stars and golden throne.

VITUPERATION. There was a very singular habit of mixing up prayers to the Bona Dea, or of substituting for them, the grossest insults and abuse. The origin of this is untraceable, and it seems impossible to reconcile the great veneration in which the pagan saint was held, with the vile epithets that were showered upon her, not merely when petitions met with no response, but even while requests were made.

MARY

Who worshipped and served the creature more than the creator (Rom. II. 5).

THE Queen of Heaven or Mary, however excellent her life on earth may have been, was a created being. She is according to Romish teaching the most potent entity in Heaven. Her Divine son while on earth indicated, as all the Gospels record, that no special sanctity attached to the fleshly instruments of His Incarnation, and more than once repudiated any influence or authority over Him on her part. Nevertheless, the Romish Church places her in such high prerogative that even the Almighty obeys her. His will is broken in her hands; it is only from her that the triune Godhead derives His sanctity or that His mercy reaches us. This notion formed no part of early Christianity nor of patristic teaching, but Origen and Tertullian advance certain unfounded and rather prurient ideas about the perpetual virginity of Mary,

Digitized by Google

even though St. Matthew says (I. 25) that after the Nativity she lived with Joseph in usual marital relations, yet those fathers are far from proposing her adoration. St. Augustin's warning, about 360, that "Nothing created is to be worshipped by man" marks the patristic doctrine of earlier and of later dates, and Epiphanius, upbraiding certain women of Collyridia who called themselves priestesses of Mary and offered to her wheaten cakes, tells them that she is not a goddess. But after the middle of the fourth century a great many (at least fifty) spurious writings were circulated, (a few were earlier) among them some relating to Mary, which spread belief in her quasi divinity, and in the fifth century Cyril of Alexandria forced "theotokos" on the Church. The following is accepted in the Romish Church and in Jesuito-Ritualism, as may be seen by pictures in shops of that type and in books of that cult—"She died of a spiritual fever into which she fell by a seraphic vehemency of divine love, which inflamed her blood and set her heart on fire." Just before the end of this singular malady, "All the apostles, wherever they might be, were caught up into the air and carried to Jerusalem, where a vision of angels appeared with a sweet psalmody, during which she resigned her soul to God. The apostles and angels still singing together, bore out and put her body in a coffin and buried it in Gethsemane; the angels and apostles continued to sing together for three days, at the end of which time Thomas arrived, and for that he wished to worship her body, the grave was opened. It emitted a sweet savour, but no body was found therein; and the apostles agreed with each other, that neither must her body see corruption, and therefore had been carried straight to Heaven."* These

* The Office of B. V., which with papal and archiepiscopal sanction is supplied to convents and some Anglican communities.

Digitized by Google

very singular occurrences are not mentioned in "The Acts of the Apostles." It is impossible within rational limits to enumerate all the letters, messages etc., sent by Mary, nor even the miracles performed by her since she first appeared as a maiden-goddess, a few, however, must be noted; but objection may by some be taken to this use of the title "goddess." Most Romish writers thus employ the word in such works as "Diva Virgo," "Pro immaculata conceptio Divæ virginis," etc. Also may here be cited some of the lauds and prayers addressed to her; they are found in such books as St Liguori's "Glories of Mary," "Ave Maria Stella," "The Office and Little Office B. V.": "Thou, O most humble and blessed Virgin, make us humble and chaste, free us from the bonds of our sins, give us purity in this life and grant us a safe passage into the next." "The only hope of sinners, for by her help alone can we hope for remission of our sins." "Come unto her all ye who labour and are heavy laden and she will give rest unto your souls.... If God is angry with a sinner and Mary takes him under her protection, she upholds the avenging arm of her son and saves him.... By her and in her and with her and from her the world receives and is to receive every good.... He who has not recourse to Mary is lost.... No one is saved but through her.... Since her conception no one has ever received any grace from God, otherwise than by the hands of Mary.... Many things are asked of God and not granted, they are asked of Mary and instantly obtained.... Mary has only to speak and her son executes all.... Oh blessed be thy pregnancy, which expiates our sins by thy maternal right to command thy son.... She opens the abyss of the mercy of God to whom she wills when she wills and as she wills, so that no sinner is lost if Mary protect him... By thee, O Mary, the Trinity is made holy.... At the command of Mary

Digitized by Google

all obey, even God".... The following impious burlesque on the Te Deum was devised and decreed by Clement V.: "We praise Thee, O Mary, we believe that thou shalt come with thy son, the judge. We therefore pray Thee help thy votaries whom He redeemed, with the precious blood He had from Thee, and we worship Thy name, ever world without end. Vouchsafe, oh Lady, to keep us this day without sin. Lady, let Thy mercy lighten upon us as our trust is in Thee." Perhaps the following might well have been left unquoted, but to the reader must be conveyed some idea of the blasphemous depths reached by mariolaters, and these specimens are far from being the most profanely indecent. "Thou didst preserve thy virginity for God.... She alone found a way of salvation for us *commercio Dei*." The last words put into the mouth of the dying by Romish, especially by Jesuit priests, are "Mary, Mother of Grace, Minister of Grace, protect me from the foe and receive me in the hour of death." It must be remembered that these are called books of "pious devotion."

In return for adulation and flattery Mary performs miracles most of which seem very fatuous. "A man left his bed every night to pray in his oratory to an image of Mary; his wife not knowing why he thus quitted her, became so jealous that she cut her throat. On his return he found the corpse already cold and the bed soaked in blood. He left the room, locked the door, and resumed his prayers to the figure, when a servant informed him that his wife was calling him. On re-entering her room he found her perfectly well.... An extravagant youth was much pressed by his creditors, but when he said Ave Maria they annulled his debts.... A tailor swallowed a needle which, sticking in his throat, nearly choked him; on gasping forth Ave Maria the needle vanished.... A starling had been taught to say Ave Maria; one day a hawk

Digitized by Google

was on the point of seizing it, it pronounced those words, and the predatory bird immediately fell dead." These and a great many less innocent stories are in Liguori's "Glories of Mary" which Cardinal Manning thus pressed on his believers: "We heartily commend this translation of the 'Glories of Mary,' and would wish it to be adopted throughout our diocese" (11th August, 1868).

Whatever Mariolatry may at first have been, it has for centuries merged into a deification of beauty, virginity and fecundity, scarcely any modification of Venus-worship, as is evidenced by many works of painters from the 15th century onward, in which the goddess, like the Aphrodite of Homer, is represented "gold enthroned and crowned with stars," bearing a child, nude like the classic Eros, in her arms. Also may these apostrophies be quoted: "Blooming rose.... All beautiful virgin.... Most sweet fruitful vine.... Bright dawn of day," and many more (fifty-three in all) such as an enamoured youth might address to a girl did he know her to be vain and silly. This too may be adduced: "Thou dost subdue the worlds by thy fleshly loveliness." (Universas vincas pulchritudine carnis.) It is regrettable that space precludes the relation of some of Liguori's very funny stories, *e.g.* that of "Father Silvio Razzi, a devout ecclesiastic, and a tender lover of our Queen Mary," but they must be omitted, their subject is rarely anything but praise of her "fleshly beauty." This cult spread widely and deeply, more especially in Latin countries; the traveller in lands almost exclusively Romish sees roadside, street and square bespottled with little boxes, each one containing a doll bedizened with much bespangled clothing, generally tawdry and garish, before which the passing peasant bows the knee. He considers it safest to do so, for he has been taught that it, or "that which it represents," is the only refuge of

Digitized by Google

sinners, being constantly busied in upholding the wrathful arm of the avenging son. Mary also, like the Bona Dea, or like Venus, undertakes several offices, such as assisting childbirth and curing sundry maladies; one church in Rome bears the name Sancta Maria Febrifuga. She also specially protects the highwaymen and bandits about the Campagna and the Abruzzi. In Paris, Notre Dame de Lorette looked after the pecuniary and other interests of a section of the *demi-monde*. There are also many confraternities and sisterhoods dedicated to her and wearing her liveries of mediæval masquerade; they go by some name compounded of Mary and of a locality or quality. Maria de Compostella, da Rimini, del divino Amoro, etc. Whether these are regarded as one or as many Marys is indeterminable, probably the latter, otherwise it would not be possible to say why one of her images should be more holy than another, or why a spot where she is stated to have appeared should rank as remarkably sacred until she or a rival Mary has favoured another locality, when the former should lose its sanctity. Several times in the 19th century rumours had spread that Mary had appeared to different people; but neighbour cleries, not liking their congregations to be enticed away, had thrown discredit on these apparitions, until in 1846 a girl of deficient intellect and her younger brother related that Mary had come to them in a meadow and talked chiefly about carter's conversation, potatoes and nuts. The local priest, Berthier, took the matter up and another Mary (de Salette) was added to the list. As it soon became a lucrative business, crowds of rivals were produced. A great many little girls, and some boys tending sheep or goats were addressed by Mary, but the scenic arrangement being deemed insufficient, they were silenced. The attractions, however, of La Salette beginning to wane, Mary entered into conversation

Digitized by Google

with another little girl (apparently less weak-minded, but more hysterical than Melanie); and she found something more interesting than potatoes and nuts to talk about, saying that her "son was very angry and his arm so heavy she was tired of holding it up." Lourdes being in picturesque scenery, within easy reach of Pau and other resorts of the wealthy, Mary's business there has been very profitable; the church is magnificent, water bottled from the brook, tapers, medals, etc. that have been stored a night in the grotto are sold to people all over the world. Of course the goddess of Salette has declined, or, as a gentleman connected with the management remarked, "It is all up with our lady of Salette, she of Lourdes has spanked her (*l'a flanquée*).

In France Mary is both a politician and a Bellona. It is not mere coincidence that so soon after Pius IX.'s immaculate-conception decree, France should have forced upon Germany a war which, until its disaster, the "dévote" Empress loved to call "ma petite guerre." Mary has re-appeared several times since then. She intimated to the managers of the Lourdes business that she intended to help French arms in the next war with Germany—hence is often called "Notre Dame de la Revanche." In July 1872 she appeared at a village in Alsace, sword in hand, with which she slaughtered countless soldiers in Prussian uniform. At Walbach in the same and following year she also showed herself, carrying a white flag studded with fleur-de-lys. "Soon a man of God shall arrive and all dissension will cease in France; he shall immediately attack Italy and rescue the pope." Since then at Jontet (1873), some indefinite number of Marys has appeared, predicting many things; but, remarkable as it may seem, nothing comes of all this.

Perhaps it may be permissible to refer to certain Scriptural passages telling us that humanity has "one

Digitized by Google

advocate with the Father," that "Jesus is the propitiation of our sins." Papism flatly contradicts the evangelists and apostles, teaching that Mary is the only hope of sinners, that only from her do blessings come to man, that no one is saved but by her, even the Almighty Trinity is only made holy by her. The Son, instead of being as He and His apostles taught, full of long-suffering and loving-kindness, is by the Romish Church depicted as a furious avenger, only restrained from destructive onslaught on mankind by the muscular efforts of Mary. That Church has gone back to the worship of the star-crowned Queen of Heaven, to the deification of female beauty, which long before the days of Christ was attended with such impure rites "in the grove."

VITUPERATION. A very singular custom must be noted, one that can only be accounted for by noticing how almost identical are Romish rites and beliefs with the old pagan cultus (Chap. IX). Even that curious act of abusing the Bona Dea, practised by the pagans, have papists transferred to her successor the goddess Mary. So Cardinal Bellarmine (16th century) wrote: "What a multitude of Catholics there are who say in words that they know God, yet by their deeds deny Him; who acknowledge Christ to be the judge of the living and the dead, yet so live as though there were no judge; who say the Virgin is the mother of our Lord, yet do not fear blasphemously to call her wh * r *" (meretricem *), the most insulting epithet that can be used to a woman.

* De arte bene moriendi. L. 1. 3.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XI

WITHHOLDING SCRIPTURE

Search the Scriptures, for they testify of me.

IT will be well to consider what Christ, the apostles and early fathers have said concerning reading the Bible. Again and again does the first-named exhort His disciples to "search the Scriptures." St. Paul commended those of Berœa, because they tested even direct apostolic teaching "by examining the Scriptures daily, to see if these things were so." "On the day called Sunday, the memorials of the Gospels and writings of the apostles are read." (Justin Mart. Apol. I. 167.) "We were enjoined by Christ Himself to put no faith in human doctrines, but in those proclaimed by the holy prophets and taught by Himself." (Dial. c. Tryphon, XLVIII.) Without quoting the phrases of some others it may be said that Basil, Augustin, Jerome, Pope Gregory—all exhort to Scripture-study, but herein the languages proved a difficulty. In 405 St. Jerome completed a translation of the Bible into Latin, his version is called the Vulgate; it was of course, at that date, in the language of the people; though inaccessible to nearly all, because but few could read, which ignorance was, however, more dense after than before the end of the 4th century, and of this the Romish bishops, when they began their aggressions on neighbouring sees, took every advantage. Also when introducing dogmas and practices contrary to

Digitized by Google

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY

the teaching of Scripture, it was important for their views that accessible versions should be so worded as to suit their ambitious aims; or, better, that people should be induced to refrain from referring to the Holy Text. For soon it was noted that persons who studied the testaments, or communities where they were much taught, were less amenable to hierarchical dictation than were those entirely ignorant of them. Hence arose even very early in Rome great distrust of the Bible, which went on increasing as a certain amount of enlightenment spread and as a few zealous men went about reading to the people direct from the Sacred Volume. The resistance to image-worship, for instance, thus arose. But it would be unprofitable to linger over the earlier symptoms of this priestly aversion to the Word of God, but go on to the first great manifestation of it in the latter half of the 12th century, when, as we shall see (Chap. XIII.), a large part of Central Europe desiring to live after the doctrines taught in Holy Scripture, were then and in ensuing years all but exterminated by the ruthless Innocent III. and his successors. But their hate was not confined merely to those who read the Bible, it was directed to the Book itself, particularly to any version of it in languages that the people could understand; for the old Latin in which Jerome's version was couched, had among the people died out, and yet mass, with its small disjointed excerpts from the Scriptures, was only read in that to them incomprehensible tongue. Very dreadful threats were thundered against people who should translate the missal (mass book). The Council of Toulouse (1229) forbade the possession or reading of a Bible or any part thereof; the Synod of Biterre (1245) prohibited its translation into any language that the people could understand. Alexander IV. (1261) tried to extinguish "the light that shone in the darkness" and excommunicated many for the sin of

Digitized by Google

reading the Testaments. Not long after this the attention of the hierarchy was much diverted by the Avignon schism; yet the pursuit of bibles, their destruction and of those who possessed them went on briskly, though decrees, encyclicals, etc., dealt less frequently with the subject until the Lollard, the Hussite, and afterwards the Lutheran defection again raised the temperature of hieratical hatred of Holy Writ to the flash-point. Violently did the papacy deluge wide districts in blood, light the pile, and faggot (Chap. XII.), invent instruments of malignant torture, yet many of the more earnest among the laity nevertheless persisted in reading or hearing the records of mankind's redemption. Priests, either more obedient or unconcerned in this study, were most of them entirely ignorant; only a few striving for a university position or benefice requiring some knowledge of language, knew more than just enough Latin to blunder with absurd mistakes through the missal and breviary (p. 52). That this is what was desired by the Romish hierarchy will be immediately shewn; it was so desired because even a slight knowledge of Holy Writ shewed that it did not sanction most of the usages and doctrines of Rome; therefore at the Council of Trent were many diatribes against the Scriptures. "By all means as little of the Gospel as may be should be read to the people, that small part which is in the mass * ought to be sufficient; neither should we permit any more to be read, for while men were content with that all went well with us; but quite otherwise since more was commonly read.... The Bible was found of little efficacy or service, and would in the present debate give all the advantage to the Lutherans.... Catholics should never attempt to argue with an opponent out of the Scriptures, to do so would only strengthen him in his

* A very minute part disjointed and unconnected.

Digitized by Google

principle that all rules of faith must be founded on them."* These admissions, so damaging to themselves as teachers and guardians of Christian faith, were accompanied by remarks insulting to Holy Writ. "The Scriptures are nothing more than ink variously figured in a book.... Waxen-natured words.... A dead letter" etc. A sub-committee was by the council appointed to draw up a list of books to be forbidden; in due time it issued with papal sanction the following: "That much more harm than good results from reading the Scriptures, therefore none are to do so unless they procure a written license from a bishop or inquisitor to possess or read the Gospels, translated by a Catholic writer into the vulgar tongue.... If any one without such license presume to keep by him or to read the Bible, he will be disqualified from receiving absolution of his sins, till he has delivered it up to the ordinary." Booksellers are prohibited under penalty from furnishing bibles to any one not possessed of a license. Pius IV. (1559) added: "As to the regulars, let them not venture to buy the Scriptures without a license from the superiors." In 1592 Clement VIII. made still more stringent these trammels. Indeed, hatred of Christ's word increased with the lapse of time. Late in the seventeenth century Quesnel, a highly esteemed member of the Gallican Church, published his "Moral Reflexions on the New Testament." In the preface he said that: "to forbid reading the Scriptures was both cruel and absurd, since their study was not only a duty, but a necessity for a Christian man." This proposition angered the Romish, more especially the

* This foundation is precisely that which St. Luke, St. Paul and many of the early fathers describe as alone reliable. The last two phrases quoted from the Tridentine clearly show how well the assembly knew that the reformed doctrines held much closer to the teaching of Christ than did the Romish Church.

Digitized by Google

Jesuit Church, and Tellier, one of that Society who in reality ruled the Vatican, induced Clement XIII. to emit the notorious bull "Unigenitus," in which this ridiculous pleonasm of abuse against Quesnel's propositions occurs—"false, captious, shocking, offensive to pious ears, ill-sounding, pernicious, injurious to the Church, blasphemous, heretical, such as have often been condemned." These epithets are not culled and juxtaposed by the writer, they follow one another in "Unigenitus" just as given here.

We must now leap over another interval, coming to quite modern times. The Romish Church declares that God Himself is not only the inspirer, but the actual author of the Bible; yet, as we have just seen, throws every obstacle in the way of its being read; but, more singular still, calls it poison, as, for instance, in 1824 Leo XII. addressed a circular to all priests, in which, speaking of the Scripture, he said: "We also, venerable brothers, in accordance with our apostolic duty, exhort you to turn away your flock from these poisonous pastures." Pius IX., in his notorious circular of 1854, speaks of the New Testament thus: "You will awake in the faithful a wholesome horror of such poisonous reading."* As the prelates, so too the priests; a gentleman of the Romish persuasion asked a parish priest, his friend: "Do you allow your flock to read the Bible?" "No, Sir, I do not. You forget that I am a spiritual physician, not a poisoner of souls." (Contemp. Review, vol. LXV. p. 578.) These are merely verbal insults, but the Romish Church offers to the sacred volume physical violence. At Barcelona a number of bibles were burned; an ultramontane journal hailed this deed—calling it, oddly enough, an act-of-faith (auto-da-fé)—as a hopeful symptom that

* Cardinal Wiseman attributed conversion to Protestantism of Romish Catholics to their having read the Bible; a further evidence of how far papism is from the Word of God.

Digitized by Google

to burn living people would soon again be permitted to clerics. (La Bandera Catolica, 25th July, 1883.) More curious still is it that the Romish Church should venture to garble and travesty what it professes to consider the very Word of God; the way in which "metanoieo" has been for pecuniary gain changed into "do penance" is hereafter (p. 190) mentioned; for similar reasons the words of the 2nd Psalm, "Kiss the Son" are altered into "embrace discipline"; the text "On earth peace and good will to men" is correctly given in the vulgatè, but in the mass of the Nativity, the only place where Romish-Catholic non-readers of the Bible are likely to encounter them, the words are thus modified: "On earth peace to men of good will," the last four words meaning, of course, such as favour papalism. In order to conceal scriptural denunciations of idolatry singular tricks are played with the second law of the Decalogue, while the fourth is made to sanction saint-days by being garbled into "Thou shall sanctify the holy days."

Within the last few years the revised version of the Bible in England reproduces, as closely and as truly as the most acute scholarship and entire honesty could possibly do, the meaning, verbal and spiritual, of the ancient text; the author of which, Rome asserts, to be God Himself. In forbidding her alumni to possess or read an unglossed and ungarbled copy of that Author's work, the Romish Church shows how well it knows that its dogmas and doings are contrary to the Words of God. St. Chrysostom therefore may be aptly quoted: "Let us not neglect the reading of the Holy Scriptures, for that is a device of the Devil, which forbids us to behold the treasure lest we should thereby be enriched."

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XII

CONFESSION

Forgive us our sins

THE above words from the mouth of Christ tell all who believe in Him to ask direct from the Father pardon for transgressions, also they clearly show that there is no barrier between a repentant sinner and his God, no connecting link with the Father save only the Son. The Romish Church contradicts the Redeemer's words, denying that the mercy of God is ever granted to direct prayer. With this negation of Christ's specific words confession in private to a priest is closely intermingled, as also is the exaction of earthly penalties for sins that have been committed, and selling permission to commit some more (p. 68). In regard to confession, early Christianity followed, with but slight modification, Judaism; in that preceding cult it was enjoined that at the yearly fast of expiation the high priest should for the whole nation make a general acknowledgment of unworthiness, also each individual was exhorted to confess, not to another man, but secretly to Jehovah, his own faults and shortcomings. The Jews who gathered at Jordan's side to hear John were baptised "confessing their sins," not privately to the prophet, but openly in the hearing of all. The primitive Christian Church also required from new converts a like public confession. The communistic constitution of the new religionists, isolated as they were among

Digitized by Google

a crowd eager to find cause of blame, rendered a fault of one member an injury to the whole community; such wrong had therefore to be confessed to the entire body, and especially was any act savouring of apostacy, such as burning incense, or pollution with lustral water, to be expiated by certain penalties, such as exclusion for a period from the inner circle of the steadfast, or providing the materials for the memorial supper—oblations. The former of these penalties was very humiliating, and so also to the wealthier of the community was confession to a public often consisting of their own slaves. Therefore, about the end of the 2nd century were established in the bishop's or presbyter's houses, species of courts where such leaders—not separately, but in a body—heard the repentant one recount his wrong-doing. Also in monasteries transgression of any one member was even more palpably an injury to the whole sodality; such had to be confessed, at first, as a very general rule, to the entire body, yet after a little time and in most establishments to the abbot or abbess; but in none of these cases was secrecy permitted, on the contrary, it was the duty of the elder, or abbot, to disclose the matter and often to consult with the community regarding the punishment, such as expulsion, degradation and so on. About the middle of the 4th century, although no distinct ecclesiastic decree in that direction is verifiable, yet can a desire for greater secrecy be traced, and in the time of Bishop Leo I. (440—461) a recognition of this wish may be noted. But publicity was still the rule, for later in the same century the Bishops of Apulia and of Campania thought it their duty to reveal openly faults that had been confessed by any of their flock. Gradually, however, privacy during the act of confession, and secrecy as to the disclosures made, became more and more the habit; yet con-

Digitized by Google

fession to a priest was not considered necessary, nor even desirable, as thus evidenced, "I pray and beseech you therefore, that you would frequently confess to God. I carry you not into an audience of your fellow-servants, neither do I constrain you to reveal your sins to men. Disclose your conscience before God. Lay open your wounds to Him and seek healing for them from Him. Lay them bare to One who reproaches not, but heals. Even should you be silent before Him; He knows all." (De incomp. Dei. Nat. St. Chrysostom, about 410.) This exhortation from the Archbishop of Constantinople was almost necessary, for since the Novatian quarrel confession had been in the eastern diocese much promoted; but a great scandal arose from the complaint of a lady, that a deacon to whom she was confessing had seduced her in the very church. Nectarius (Chrysostom's predecessor) forbade private confession (390), and abolished the office of Presbyter pœnitentiarius. It is, however, possible, even probable that many whom their conscience troubled may have sought relief by confessing to a priest, and it would almost of necessity follow that those accustomed to be thus consulted should in their minds formulate for each class of sin a code of punishment—or, as soon called, penance. This leads us to consider the meaning of that Greek verb (*μετανοεω*), which in English bibles is translated "repent." "Noeo" is "to think," and "meta" as prefix to a verb always denotes a change; hence the conjunction signifies "think differently"—"change evil-mindedness." In Romish bibles it is nearly always rendered "Do penance," that is undergo some penalty, self-inflicted or imposed—a mode of translation entirely subversive of the correct meaning, not indicating that improvement is to be sought, but only that a fine for the misdemeanour, in money or in comfort, is to be paid. Of course, the payment made, the penance-

Digitized by Google

doer (in contra-distinction to the repentant) is free to repeat the act at the same or somewhat enhanced price. The mistranslation has been in all ages very profitable to the Romish Church.

Although Leo had about the middle of the 5th century sanctioned private confession, yet it was not enforced (save for catechumens at baptism), till much later by Innocent III., at the 4th Lateran Council (1215), when the act was made a sacrament, and when it was decreed that every one of either sex, having reached years of discretion, must confess annually to a priest, and the more surely to capture immature minds the discretionary age is fixed at seven. At the same time the priesthood arrogated to itself Divine powers; up to the end of the 9th century the formula pronounced after confession was "Deus absolvat te" (May God forgive thee), after that it became "Ego absolvo te" (I forgive thee), the use of the redundant pronoun strongly emphasizing the personal claim. Thus priests taught substitution for trust in the Father and the Son, idolatrous credulity in themselves. Even this did not attain to sacerdotal ideals; having usurped God's prerogative, clerics next seized upon His Almight. "The throne of the priest is in the skies and to him belongs it to administer the affairs of Heaven.... Heaven receives from earth the power of judging, the Master must obey the servant and ratify above whatever the priest may decide here below." (Card. Pallavicini's Istoria del Conc. di Trento, Lib. XII. cap. 22.) "So great is the power of the priest that the judgments of Heaven itself are subject to his decision...." "God Himself is bound to abide by the decisions of priests." (The Catholic Priesthood, with Cardinal M'Closky's approval.) "In giving absolution the ordinary priest is superior to the angels and even to the Blessed Virgin, for they cannot do what he has done." (Peter of Palermo, 14th century.)

Digitized by Google

Confession to these superiors of angels was, though private, not auricular till the 16th century in Italy, till the 17th in Germany; when, however, that method was introduced, it rapidly prevailed because people mistakenly thought that the penitent's face was hidden from the priest in the box. When the confessant has detailed all remembered sins, cross-questioning begins, for guidance of which a number of books have been written, approved by the pope and distributed to priests; they are of an exceedingly prurient nature, and with the correlative works on casuistry, such as Manuals for confessors, Moral Theologies etc., might more properly be named guides to obscenity. This must lead to some review of earlier centuries, for such writings could not be spawned crudely on an unprepared world; they were merely the evolution in print of more than a thousand years of sacerdotal delinquency.

We have seen that as early as A.D. 390 scandals arose in the Church (Constantinople) in regard to priestly misconduct in the confessional. In 398 the Council of Toledo, in 500 Symmachus, denounced the frequency of this crime. Calixtus II. (1119—1122) in doing the same, speaks of the woman as "not a partner in the guilt, but as a victim who found destruction where she sought salvation." Savonarola described Italian cities as "full of these wolves in sheep's clothing, constantly striving to lead the innocent into sin." Erasmus relates that a theologian of Louvain refused to absolve a priest who had confessed to him that he maintained vicious intimacy with more than two hundred nuns who were under his "spiritual direction." So it has ever been, so too, as we shall see immediately, is it now; what the Romish Church calls a sacrament is simply a means of making the world a vast lupinar for the indulgence of clerical lubricity. And for more facile attainment of this, guides have been written, casuistry

Digitized by Google

evolved. Here we need only mention the horribly foul "De Matrimonio" of Sanchez, 1592 (published with full approbation of Clement VIII.), Moult (1865), Gury (1880), Busenbaum (1884) etc. Those which practically have succeeded most others in Western Europe are Moral Theology (Liguori 1755), and Guide to Confessors (Gaume 1850—9). It is difficult to say which of these two works deserves the palm for prurient nastiness. Indeed the former writer thought it necessary when penning this particular part of his book to precede it by an apology for the supposed brevity of his very ample discourse. "It grieves me concerning this matter that it contains so much filthiness as by its very nature will disgust pure minds to give a longer dissertation." This obscenity is to be propounded to confessants (even ~~to~~ children of seven are among these), whose pure minds are thus to be polluted. Among the questions are many concerning unmentionable acts of uncleanness; also many concerning perfectly licit matters, but such as are held sacred between spouses. On these the confessor is directed to cross-examine by no means the husband, but always the wife.

Into the hands of celibates while in the heyday of youth this literature is placed, and among the subjects Liguori treats—ostensibly for warning, but wearing much more the aspect of instruction—is how a woman at the confession-box may be artfully approached. * He makes solicitation and committal very smooth for the priest by formulating a rule that, though frequently peccant, he need not resign his office, nor even confess his faults to whatever other angel may have charge of his conscience. He may, after commission, absolve his victim, and tell her that this has rendered her perfectly innocent, therefore, if accused of the wrong-

* The casuist's aphorism "si non caste tamen caute" quoted in a future chapter may also here be cited.

Digitized by Google

doing, she must, in the interests of truth, deny. The instructor adds: "How many priests there are, yet so few good ones; how many, previously good, have forfeited their holiness by yielding to these carnal temptations." He does not consider worthy his saintly notice the condition of women ruined by ordained satyrs, ambushed under pretence of a sacrament, making the very church a convenience for the commission of sexual crime. "The people instead of being reformed are corrupted by their pastors." This is not Protestant calumny, being quoted from the bull (1529) of Pope Alexander IV. Abelard (Serm. XXIX.) deplored the frequent seductions of nuns by their confessors. Bishop Poore (1217) threatened soliciting priests with punishment. Martin de Frias blamed "contaminators who push their indecent enquiries on account of the delectation they feel in doing so" (fol. XV*a*). Chaucer, Savonarola and Petrarch describe confessors as habitually misusing their office. The conduct of the clergy supposed to be endowed with the power of admission to Heaven causing Alanus de Insula to remark (1137—40) that "the keys of Heaven and of Hell had somehow been interchanged." Many bulls and episcopal commands were uselessly issued, the evil continued, and continues. In 1548 the Bishops of Köln and of Trier vainly endeavoured to reform their clergy. The Dukes of Bavaria (Albert) and of Cleves sent written requests to the Council of Trent to permit priestly marriage. "If this were done, the cause of that promiscuous licentiousness of priests, which had wrought so much evil in the Church would be obviated" (Pallavic. LXVII. c. 4). At a diet at Nürnberg (early in 1522) a list of grievances was drawn up and sent to the pope;* it contained these phrases: "The license afforded to those who, debarred by the canons from marriage,

* Adrian VI. who was poisoned by the cardinals in order to forestall his projected reforms.

Digitized by Google

abandon themselves night and day to attempts upon the virtue of the wives and daughters of the laity, sometimes gaining their ends by flattery and presents, sometimes by the opportunities offered in the confessional. It is not uncommon, indeed, for women to be openly carried off by their priests, while their fathers and husbands were threatened with vengeance should they attempt to recover them." Passing on to much later times. "The boasted chastity of the priesthood has filled the Church with demons in place of angels, who lead their flocks to ruin by their acts and example." (Petronio, priest in Istria Esamin, 15 Oct. 1867.) The Council of Venice (1859) ordered confessors to observe the papal decrees against solicitation in the confessional. The congregation of the Inquisition instructed all prelates, that in this matter the "Papal constitutions were neglected." These admonitions would not have been issued did not contamination by confessors abundantly continue. In 1556, during one of the many lacunæ in the Council of Trent, Paul IV., feeling that priestly debauchery gave great leverage to the opponents of Romish dominance and that some amelioration was absolutely necessary, sent a rescript to the inquisitors of Grenada, ordering them to proceed against those whom the public voice accused of seducing women in the confessional. The inquisitors and archbishop, consulting, agreed to do this with great caution, lest disclosure of what habitually took place should altogether deter people from confessing; the matter ended in sending round a caution to the priests, with an admonition to keep the substance of Paul's letter strictly secret; and the suspension, ostensibly for heresy, of the most notorious defilers of religion. It being thus evident to the priests that inquisitors and bishops were half-hearted in the matter, nothing worth mentioning came of Paul's action; thus his successor, Pius V., was, during the first three

Digitized by Google

years of his pontificate, overwhelmed from all countries with complaints concerning the continual seduction of women in the confessional, Spain being pre-eminent. Pius therefore (4th May, 1562) sent to the inquisitor-general of Seville a bull, directing him to investigate the delinquency; a period of thirty days was assigned, during which twenty secretaries were to receive accusations. At the end of this time, those officials declared themselves terribly overworked, and the business not within measurable distance of completion; another like period was allotted, and so on for four months. Still complainants were crowding to the office, the work appeared as far from completion as ever; the disgust of people at finding that all or nearly all clerics were but tonsured violaters from whom their womankind was never safe, reached a dangerous point—the business was stopped. Not one in a dozen of the priests convicted was punished. Fourteen years after, the Inquisition had again to institute like proceedings. So little amendment followed that fresh cautions were constantly required; thus, omitting episcopal admonitions, we find recorded (and several from the Inquisition were secret) between 1608 and 1803, thirteen papal and inquisitorial censures. Later still, in 1862, Pius IX. and, in 1867, the congregation of the Inquisition called the attention of all archbishops and bishops to the frequent neglect of regulations concerning abuse of the confessional. Popes and councils have uselessly tried for fourteen centuries to correct this evil. The effort is doomed to failure, for the corruption lies in the system itself—in its very core.

In the meantime a number of foresworn English clerics formed two societies (1855 and 1872) for the destruction of that mother to whom they had pledged allegiance, and among other misdeeds they gave publicity to the "Priest in Absolution" (another translation of Gaume's Manual). It was denounced

Digitized by Google

(1877) by Lord Redesdale in the House of Lords, creating such general and righteous disgust that the second part was reserved "for private circulation." The trickery and treachery of the men constituting these societies and pretending to be of the English Church, though from the first, or very shortly, becoming Jesuits, have been too well and recently described by Mr. Walsh to need more than a reference to the "Secret History of the Oxford Movement." Yet attention may be directed to Pusey's elaborate deceit, who, in the Library of the Fathers, which he edited, wrote, or allowed to appear under his name, much condemnation of confession to priests, quoting from Tertullian, Chrysostom, Hilary and many other pristine fathers (Tertullian, p. 367, note), and this at a time when he was luring women into its practice, though knowing full well its dangers and evils, for he laments that clergymen, his imitators, should send all but attractive women unheard away, and devote themselves only to pretty girls ("Priest in Absolution," p. 102). Also, quoting with concurrence Liguori and Gaume, he wrote that the confessional "is the road by which a number of Christians go down to hell" (*ib.* p. 315). One wonders if he and members of those two betrayal societies conceive that sacerdotal duty consists in guiding their parishioners along that path.

The Gospels teach that man shall have confidence in Christ. St. Paul enjoins "boldness through our faith in Him" (Eph. III. 12), and to "rejoice in Christ Jesus having no confidence in flesh" (Phil. III. 23). The few words from the very mouth of Christ Himself which head this chapter, tell mankind to ask pardon for trespasses straight and direct from God. The Father asks of His children complete and trustful confidence. When they have so far attained to it, that they can "disclose their conscience before God, lay open their wounds to Him and seek healing from

Digitized by Google

Him." "He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." Nowhere in His records is it said that He weighs and measures transgression, plumbs the depth of evil or maps out sin into categories and classes—venial or other. He and His Apostles simply say that the debt of him who trusts in the Gospel message is already paid; if only he confide and deplore his default to Him who holds the balance. But also must be considered how it may stand with him who will not accept the gracious message and declines to believe in His Infinite Mercy, who so utterly mistrusts it that he needs must interpose another sinful being as a shield between himself and his Redeemer. Such man must beware lest his craven want of faith prove a greater sin than that which he so fears to bring before the Heavenly judge. Unnecessary is it to point to the usurpation of Divine power underlying the blasphemous formula "Ego te absolvo," nor need further be emphasized the evils which from the first have been caused by meticulous priestly prying in confession, the history of which in the Romish Church is one of foulness; while Pusey's remarks as he introduced the evil into the English Church, show that the same dangers cling to the system and to the men administering it here. No one therefore can be surprised that the large majority of educated Englishmen regard a confession-box in a parish church, or the trick of receiving confessions privately in the vestry, as the outward and visible sign of corruption, imminent or already present in the district; while the frequent appointment to influential preferments of clerics, who practise confession, belong or have belonged to one of the betrayal societies, cause those same educated persons to conclude with dismay, that in the Church of England perjury, as far as her articles are concerned, is the quickest road to promotion.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XIII

THE INQUISITION

The tender mercies of the wicked are cruel

THE 11th and 12th centuries were a time of difficulty for Romish supremacy. It could indeed hardly be otherwise than that Gregory VII.'s efforts for universal domination, the intolerable claims of priests, (Chap. V.), the intrusion of many dogmas not deducible from Scripture and opposed to the teaching of Christ, as also the luxury and debauchery of almost all the clergy should call forth much disapproval. At this period, therefore, both within and without the Church, were many opposed to its newer teachings and to most of its practices. One of the most learned theologians of that era, Berengarius, Archbishop of Angers, proved the falsity of transubstantiation, (p. 165). Abelard began his long, intermittent course of teaching about 1110; his views, condemned as heretical, attracted a great number of pupils; among them, Arnold of Brescia, whose discourses drove Pope Eugene III. out of Rome (1147), and obliged his successor, Adrian IV., to interdict his own city, in which, however, he (Arnold) was subsequently burnt. The idea of intellectual liberty prevalent, but sternly repressed, had an aspect for popes more vital than the religious. They had, partly through Hildebrand's efforts, but still more by the free use of forgery, become emperors, and chose to regard all princes merely as their satraps. This, though its basis was

Digitized by Google

forgery, was chiefly supported by the claim of power to admit or exclude whom they would from Heaven. Refusal to credit this was not merely to abjure sacerdotal dictation, but to rebel against papal imperialism. Religion and monarchism were inextricably mixed, and though the chief incentive to violent cruelty may with some popes have been the former, yet the motive of most, if we may deduce motive from deeds, was simply to uphold their imperial status. More especially does this seem to be the case with Innocent III. (1198—1216), whose savagery required very deep draughts of blood.

At this period, that part of France which lies south of the Loire was, in culture, far in advance of the northern section. Arts and literary study, including that of Scripture, were actively pursued. This civilization extended from the Bay of Biscay, including the north of Spain, to the Rhine, and from Metz to and including the Savoy. Where men think, there must be differences, or, as St. Paul calls them (1 Cor. XI. 19), *haireseis*, and in all this district were many, whose opinions diverged from the papal. That section which is just now of interest for our subject, had their chief centre at Albiga, and therefore were called Albigenses. The origin and details of their tenets are obscure, nor are they for our present purpose of moment; they were pure, even ascetic, they repudiated with horror idolatry or image-worship, as probably also the ceremonial mass and sacerdotal dominance. It seems certain that they recognized two supernatural powers, one for good the other for evil, which gave a handle to calumnious assertions that they were devil-worshippers, notwithstanding that the Romish Church itself acknowledges two existencies, God and Satan. This sect had existed since the middle of the 6th century chiefly in Bulgaria, but had extended west during the succeeding six hundred years.

Digitized by Google

In the latter half of the 12th century, and in the more civilized parts of France, other dissentients began to exercise much influence, and in 1170 Peter Waldo took the lead in teaching direct from the Bible the herdsmen on hillsides and in meadows; he formed a society of preachers at and about Toulouse and Lyons, whence the sect was called "Poor Men of Lyons," and from its leader's name "Waldenses." Among their doctrines they taught that the pope, if really the successor of Christ, would, like Him, be poor and humble. Evidently, if the impero-papal court were to maintain its luxury and supremacy, such doctrines must be suppressed, and this the arrogant Lothario dei Segni, *alias* Innocent III., when he won his election, at once proceeded to do by sending legates into the neighbourhood of Toulouse; they did not succeed. Early in 1205 a priest named Dominic was travelling from Spain to Italy through this district, and was consulted as to the best means of dealing with these people; his advice was to a certain extent followed, but still with small success. Angered that his imperious almight should be questioned, Innocent ordered the bishops to visit personally or by legate all suspected districts, to gather as many of the inhabitants as possible and to enforce an oath of betraying any holding anti-papal views, attending meetings or absenting themselves from Romish performances; to refuse such an oath was to be an acknowledgment of heresy. This was the beginning of the Inquisition, elaborated, apparently, on Dominic's advice. But the people were too loyal to each other to furnish many denunciations, and the process was slower than suited Innocent's arbitrary temper. He ordered the Count of Toulouse, in whose territories the greater number of Albigenses lived, to slaughter them; he refused and the pope instantly excommunicated him. The usual result followed: in two years

Digitized by Google

the Count was obliged to yield, to do penance, and to make war on his own subjects. In the persecution that followed, the Waldenses were involved; their chief offence in the eyes of Innocent was that they insisted on reading the Bible in the vernacular provençal as translated by Waldo. Possession of this work entailed a death-sentence, and all copies seized were burnt amid the jeers and insults of the soldiery. For Innocent had gathered together and placed under the leadership of Simon de Montfort, large bands of the most ruthless scoundrels procurable, and to these the pope consigned the possessions of all whom they might murder by the most cruel methods devisable. Still further to stimulate atrocities, he preached a "crusade" against these humble people, whose chief offence was that they clung to Scripture teaching; and lest any touch of pity might mitigate barbarity, he promised, to such of the marauders as murdered the most, remission of all sins, and to any who might die during the crusade immediate passage straight to Heaven. The vilest treacheries, under the dictum that no faith is to be kept with heretics, were used; towns were induced under promise of immunity to surrender, and all the inhabitants slaughtered. When Bezieres was thus taken, Arnold Abbot of Clairvaux was consulted as to the treatment of the citizens. "Kill every one of them," said this Christian, or rather, Romish prelate, "God will know His own." The whole land was deluged with blood and polluted with atrocious cruelties; the hellish or papal orgie of horror continued at its height for nearly four years, then, either from lack of victims or of loot, slowly declined. Yet, though people may be murdered, ideas persist, there are even at the present time, in spite of several reiterated persecutions and slaughters, Waldenses in the valleys of the Savoy; the Albigenses were more completely annihilated, the survivors join-

Digitized by Google

ing the other sect. Scattered, the people retired northward, set up a factory of bibles in Metz, settled along the lower reaches of the Rhine, wandered into Denmark and even to distant England. How far their ideas influenced, if at all, Duns Scotus, Wickliff and others cannot be traced; certain it is that, though Innocent slaughtered whole populations, he failed to extinguish disapproval of Romish manners and practices; denunciations of sacerdotal iniquities emanating from laymen, priests and prelates became still more numerous and trenchant.

The machinery constructed by Dominic and the pope was meanwhile elaborated and further developed, it invaded all countries. Italy (save Naples and Venice), the Iberian and Balkan peninsulas were its chief centres; in those countries, as the life and liberty of every inhabitant, and more especially his property, was at the mercy of the institution, the inquisitors were very fine fellows indeed; more especially in Spain, where it first directed its attentions to the small number of Waldenses, then to Jews and Saracens, most of whom (irresistible bait) were rich, and afterwards to such wealthy Spaniards as could be accused, truly or mendaciously, of heresy. The inquisitors lived in palaces, had immense retinues of subordinates and of servants, their military guard and a numerous court of nobles (signori patentati) with privileges of dress and arms. The ranks of these gentlemen were always full, for the Inquisition spread terror everywhere; the only safeguard against its attacks was to join its ranks in some capacity; on all thus doing, the strictest silence with regard to its actions was enforced under the most deterrent threats. Also attached to this "holy" office was a large body of men called "familiars," of these Montanus (writing 1560) says: "they were bawds, thieves, shifters and the vilest sort of people, that live by filching, that cannot or will not hold their

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Digitized by Google

hands if they should hang for it." The task of these people was to denounce such as would serve as victims to the inquisitors, and evidently it was to their advantage that the accused should be rich, for the procedure was thus: no proof or even probability was required, a mere accusation sufficed; the incriminated one was seized, his house occupied by familiars, his family, of whatever age or sex, thrust into the street, after their persons had been searched, their money and portable valuables appropriated by these sorry gentry, as also any portable property in the chambers. What was stored in locked coffers or what seemed valuable enough to be enquired after was reserved for annexation by higher officials. Bystanders had carefully to avoid any sign of pity, still more of indignation, such would at once have been noted as approval of heresy. On the mere accusation of a (legally of two, but this point was loosely held), familiar or other, the unfortunate one was hurried away and plunged into a cell of what was called the *casa santa.* These cells were rarely larger than 12 × 10 feet, and in each from four to eight persons were confined; such cell possessed either no window, or only a very small one high up, opening into a passage; the filth of such non-ventilated places is indescribable. No prisoner was allowed egress, one or two tubs insufficient for human needs were, unless the gaoler forgot or felt disinclined, emptied once a week; the food was insufficient and bad. Here the unlucky wretch was left, his case unheard for weeks or months.

At length, unless he had committed suicide or otherwise had died, he was brought before the court. The inquisitor, assuming a benign expression, asked his name, and appeared. perhaps often was ignorant of the whole matter, most certainly every prisoner was so; not one ever learned the nature of the charge, nor the name of the accuser. After several

Digitized by Google

artfully indirect questions he was told to confess to he knew not what; if he acknowledged to something not in the denunciation, he only added to this another, perhaps more tangible item. Yet some few, knowing that those who did so on a first occasion might be less severely dealt with, did confess to something and were awarded punishment. Those who did not were sent back to the dungeon, that a longer term might "soften their hearts," a peri-phrase for destroying their health, and with it their courage. There they were left for periods varying from half a year to three or more. The second hearing was much like the first, only, on refusal to confess, the accused was taken to a chamber, dark but for torches, and deep under ground, so that no shrieks should reach the outer world. If still he did not confess, another sojourn in the dungeon, and usually renewal of torture in a few days. At the third hearing a very bitter farce was enacted. What was termed a copy of the accusation was given him, only this document contained with the specific plaint other imputed heretical sayings and doings inserted by the procurator; if the accused, defending himself against certain ones, left the real denunciation unanswered or but slightly touched upon, he was considered as pleading guilty to the main indictment. He was also allowed an advocate; but the sham functionary was never permitted to know the nature of the accusation nor to speak to the prisoner, unless first gaining the consent of the inquisitor for what he wished to say. After this travesty the cell again, often preceded by renewed torture, then a summons to a fresh hearing (often omitted), and sentence. "Yet may a man see oftentimes—yea, almost daily great numbers die in prison, some hunger-starved, some extremely racked and dismembered in every joint of their bodies, some even in the very middest of their tortures yielding up

Digitized by Google

the ghost between the tormentors' hands, inasmuch as the inquisitors themselves will say of some, that they were as harmless and as innocent as any one could be." * The inquisitors never denied themselves the pleasure of watching the tortures, the same author a page or two later wrote: "The inquisitors command that the accused be stripped stark naked, be it he or she—yea, though it were well known to be the most honest and chaste maid or matron in all the city, and there these rank rammes declare that they will not lose that devilish delight that they take in such shameful and unseemly sight." Now and again the racking strain relaxed, the sufferer was exhorted to confess; on refusal, signal was given for augmented torture, until the agonized writhings ceased to amuse, or until the victim, having swooned or died, could squirm no more. †

"If any in these dungeons are noisy, the gaolers, saving the trouble of inquiry, flog the whole number, men, women, boys and maids, first stripping them naked that the staves may be felt more sharply, and this often so severely as to lame them for life."

A very few, unless in their ancestry, however remote, were Moors or Jews, might after confession and recantation gain a slightly less grim treatment than those who refused to acknowledge heresy. This does not mean that after months or years in the above described dungeon they were simply dismissed; the mere accusation, though unproven, entailed some punishment, such as scourging at the cart-tail through every street of

* There are several examples of this, we need only mention Doña Juania Bohorques, who died from torture (1557). The inquisitors then pronounced her "innocent," and said that "she in the grave ought to be grateful to them for this honour." (Don Adolfo de Castro, p. 255.)

† The above is quoted direct or abbreviated, from Montanus, who was secretary to the "holy" office for some years.

Digitized by Google

the city, or wearing, as warning all that they had better not speak to him, a conspicuously ridiculous dress. Also he had been deprived of every thing; his family, unless likewise subjected to inquisitorial amenities, had been scattered, probably had fallen into such degradation as abject poverty often brings. Others of those who escaped death by fire, were kept in prison for life, many were condemned to galley-slavery, others, after being flogged through the town, were released with the usual warning about silence. Then might be seen—limping painfully through the streets on rack-distorted limbs—an emaciated, pallid, purblind figure, venturing to speak to none, still less to seek wife, daughter or even son.

A very large proportion of those who had on the rack afforded by their shrieks and writhings so much amusement to the inquisitors, were "handed over to the secular arm" with a request that no blood should be shed. This was a very transparent hypocrisy, and if the civil magistrates did not very quickly carry out the intended infliction, they very soon received a warning from the *casa santa*. In the Netherlands, for instance, the seculars were often admonished by Cardinal Granville; the request to avoid bloodshed was not very artful, much experience had taught inquisitors that he who is burnt alive loses no blood.* In Spain, between the middle of the 15th to beyond that of the 18th century, it was in most towns customary two or three times a week to burn alive at least one person; but in the bloom-time of this institution under Torquemada, Deza and Cineros, neither

* Romish apologists of the Inquisition say that many of these burnings were in effigy, that is not true. A very few living persons were strangled at the stake before the pile was lit; images of denounced persons who escaped were also burnt, and many who had died under torture or otherwise in the dungeons, were subjected to this posthumous vengeance; such make up by far the larger majority of those classed in effigy.

Digitized by Google

the inquisitors nor Philip were satisfied with a festivity of cruelty so little imposing, and at uncertain intervals days were set apart for especially joyful celebrations of fanaticism. Also, if the king had escaped a danger, he thought the most acceptable way of giving thanks was to direct the inquisitors to supply an unusually large number of victims to be sacrificed as living human burnt-offerings to the all-merciful God. Thus he had been taught by Romish doctrine. On all such occasions, blasphemously called "Acts of faith," a number of maimed wretches, garbed in yellow smocks rudely painted with flames and devils, were marched through dividing crowds to the pile of fagots surrounding a post, to which the unhappy one was bound. While this was still a recent ceremonial the wood was at once lighted; but soon the inquisitors craved for a longer period of enjoyment, and they ordered sometimes the executioner, but more generally some monks, "to dress his beard," which meant this. Before the faggots were fired, dry straw and twigs were tied to a metal rod, set ablaze and held to the victim's face, slowly charring his lips, eyes, and other features. Also was invented another method of prolonging the inquisitors' amusement. Instead of a stationary post the victim was bound to a revolving wheel or movable lever, so that he was alternately raised from or let down into the fire, thus his sufferings might be indefinitely protracted. It is asserted by many Romish writers, that the object of these doings was that the torment inflicted on earth was discounted in increased measure from those due in a future world. Such contention is entirely opposed to truth, for a part of the ceremony at an Auto-da-fe consisted of commanding all the devils in hell to exercise their utmost malice in torturing eternally the victims; but it seems improbable that such fiends could in this direction be more ingeniously malignant than priests.

Digitized by Google

It is impossible accurately to compute the number of persons whom, during its efflorescence, this "holy office" murdered. A considerable difficulty occurs with regard to Torquemada (1481—98), first inquisitor-general. Llorente says that in 1481 he burnt two thousand people. Hefele avers that this number must cover the whole period of his tenure; both are probably wrong, the latter especially. Torquemada is well known to have been more profuse in death-sentences than any other. It happens that his two successors filled the situation for exactly the same period as he did (eighteen years). By adding together the number of their slaughterings we obtain a total probably considerably smaller than Torquemada's murders, but to avoid any chance of overstatement they shall be so accepted; this malefactor burnt alive, therefore, more than four thousand, two hundred and fifty persons. Studying records of the first five chiefs of the Inquisition, we find that they thus killed in forty-three years twelve thousand and seventy-eight people in Spain alone. To these must be added "burnt in effigy" and "other punishments"; * the total number of inflictions amounting to two hundred and fifty-eight thousand, seven hundred and eighty-two, *i.e.* for forty-three years over six thousand per annum, or a daily average of twelve actually sentenced to an infliction, not counting the large numbers arrested, shut up and never heard of again, chiefly women whom inquisitors and their agents used.

The numbers that in the Netherlands fell victim to the Spanish Inquisition can hardly be computed; Grotius gives it as a hundred thousand, the Prince of Orange as five times as many. To these must be added a non-computable number of similar atrocities under the

* The former includes those garrotted before fire was applied, images of those killed or dying in dungeons; the latter means galley-slavery, prolonged flogging, life-long incarceration etc.

Digitized by Google

Dominicans, Droso (Dorso) and Conrad of Marburg in Germany, those sacrificed in France when Henry II. permitted the Inquisition to intrude, and a great mass in England and other countries. In 1492—4 the West Indies and some of the American mainland was discovered; there the inquisitors found a happy hunting ground,—debauching, torturing, murdering, and enslaving the natives, because, never having heard of Christ, they were guilty of not being Christians. Some lovers of the Inquisition excuse such atrocities on the plea that these people practised human sacrifice. If true, it was only customary among certain tribes as an annual or biannual ceremony, and at all events it befits but ill the Romish Church to bring such accusation while it was daily offering up living human burnt-sacrifices to the Moloch of papo-cæsarism. The horrors of this institution are also palliated on the plea that they were not much more cruel than secular tribunals of the time; even were this not false the argument is curious, for it assumes that the proper function of a Church, theoretically Christian, is to be as bad or worse than the rest of the world.

Let the reader consider the misery thus inflicted, the mental and moral degradation produced by tempting or terrorizing spouses to betray one another, children their parents, servants their masters; none could trust even his nearest, no friendship, no love could hold; the confidence on which the ties of family, the foundation of civilization rest was shattered. The precise numbers that suffered, revolting as is the record, are of less importance than the ferocity of the Romish Church to support its domination by invoking the stake and fire for the destruction of its opponents. The proposal by James and John to call down fire from Heaven upon some who did not accept Christ's words (Luke IX. 54, 5—6) elicited from Him a horrified rebuke. Can the phrase: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye

Digitized by Google

are of," have been prompted by Divine foreknowledge of what would be done by that which called itself His Church, and horrible to say in His Name?

We must diverge a little to consider the bull "Summis Disiderantes" (Innocent VIII. 1489). It seemed that in some countries the Inquisition furnished too few victims to satisfy Romish cruelty, the bull declared, therefore, that such countries as disliked the burning alive of their inhabitants, were more than all others infested by witches and warlocks, *e.g.*, England and especially Germany. The account of witch doings is borrowed from ancient Roman ideas disfigured by the prurience of many reputed theologians (among them Aquinas). The pope ordered inquisitors to look sharply after these imagined personages, thus enlarging the scope of the "holy office" and affording food for much thought on papal infallibility.

We return to Spain: most of the female captives suffered what they may probably have considered worse than death: "The treatment of women is too shameful to be described; the prettiest fare least badly. Several released ones have been so shamed by the horrors they have undergone, that they have fled the kingdom and hidden where they are unknown. The public will one day be disabused of the idea that there is any holiness in this 'holy office,' but now when one of these women is allowed to go, she is made to take a tremendous oath never to reveal what has occurred in the *casa sancta*, and to this are added terrific threats as to what will happen to her should she venture to break the silence." "I ought to observe that the inquisitors were accustomed to sacrifice to their lascivious lusts the chastity of matrons, as well as virgins, who were secluded in the secret cells under charges of heresy. These unhappy creatures, frightened by the ill usage they suffered, and the still more terrible fate that awaited them, some deluded

Digitized by Google

by the promise and hope of saving their life and liberty, and some through dread of violation, fell victims to the most brutal and dishonourable of passions." (p. 256, Don Adolfo di Castro.) And worse than this, "Ye evil doers. What! have you neither honor nor shame that after having defiled matrons and maidens entrapped into your power ye should consign them to the flames? Oh! impious wretches, your conduct is worse than the elders to Susannah." (Miguel de Montserrate. Libro intitulado. In coena Domini.) This author is confirmed by Cipriano de Valera, who also quotes this conversation of a certain inquisitor held smilingly and gracefully with a clerical friend: "I am never satisfied when I .... (*too indecent for translation*) a pretty girl, until soon afterwards I have also burnt her." (Los dos tratados.)

During the War of Succession in Spain, in which French troops were engaged, the general, Legal, after the battle of Almanza, 25th April, 1767, occupied Saragossa. The Inquisition excommunicated his troops, and endeavoured to stir up sedition; he therefore cleared out the *casa santa*. Four hundred prisoners were released from the dungeons, and living not in them, but in the palatial rooms of the inquisitors were sixty young ladies, who formed the harem of the holy fathers. These gentlemen having a wide district to choose from had provided themselves with the most beautiful women procurable, most of whom had afterwards little difficulty in finding among the French officers more regular mates. Mr. Gavin, a priest, was in Saragossa at this time and saw some of these ladies; but did not learn the whole history till some years after, on again meeting one of them in France; this is her narrative: "She was the daughter of Counsellor Balbriga of Saragossa, and when calling with her mother one day on the Countess of Altarass, Don Francesco di Torrepoin also paid that lady a

Digitized by Google

visit. He regarded the young girl earnestly for some minutes and then put to her some questions on matters of faith. On taking leave, he said significantly: "I shall bear you in mind until I see you again." That night her father's household was disturbed by violent knocking. The question, 'Who knocks?' was answered by: 'The Inquisition.' The familiars carried off the child to the *casa santa.* Instead of being thrown, as she expected, into a dungeon she was taken into magnificent apartments, where a woman—Mary—waited on her, and trying to soothe her, said that she need fear neither torture nor death if she would be complaisant. She, the next day, repeated these assurances, at the same time shewing a rotatory contrivance for inflicting painful death, and 'the dry pan', explaining that any one put there, a gentle fire being lighted, was slowly reduced to ash. . . ." The reader will not require telling of her interviews with Don Francesco. . . . In a few days she was allowed to mix with other similar captives and made friends with one who, after precautions against eavesdropping, said: "We young ladies at present number fifty-two, and we lose every year six or eight; but we never know what becomes of them, and it is our constant torment to think that when the holy fathers get tired of any one of us, she will be put to death, for never will they run the risk of being discovered. We very often get new inmates; I have seen here as many as seventy-two at a time. If one happen to prove with child she is removed to a larger apartment, where she sees no one but the maid until delivery. The child is taken away, but we never know what becomes of it. I have been in this place six years and was not above fourteen when the inquisitors took me from my father's house."

Of late years it has pleased the Jesuits, especially those allied in England to the Oxford Movement, to

Digitized by Google

cloak the contemporary evidence of inquisitorial ferocity; such is futile, for, until its power was quenched, the holy office and its admirers* were accustomed to boast of its lethal activity. Also they say that these doings are only characteristic of a social condition long past and incapable of return. In England Jesuito-Ritualism zealously fosters such ideas; but in countries where papalism dares to ventilate its ardent hopes, desire for re-establishment of the Inquisition is expressed. For instance, in 1853 the Jesuit newspaper, "Civilta Cattolica," called it a sublime spectacle of social perfection (un sublimo spectacolo della perfezione soziale) and saw in any expression of dislike to it "a manifest sign of mental confusion." Whoever regards it with disfavour and regrets that the Church should "fortify her excommunications" with torture and death, is called "rebellious against God, be he philosopher or theologian, protestant or catholic." A little later the same journal, reporting the making of a saint out of the truculent inquisitor, Arbues, remarks: "The raging against the Inquisition does not surprise us; it is an old pastime of heretics and of bad catholics to insult with invective and calumny that holy tribunal, which the zeal of popes has set up as guardian of the faith." (Vol. XI., p. 276.) For Spain the "Bandera Catolica" is what the "Civilta" is for Italy. On July 25, 1883, some imported bibles were burnt at Barcelona, which the "Bandera," strangely inverting the meaning of words, called "an act of faith," and in its jubilant comments said: "Renewal of the holy tribunal of the Inquisition must soon take place," and rejoices thus: "We judge our esteemed readers will read with *great pleasure* (the italics are ours) the statistics of those who suffered under the holy tribunal from the year 1481 to 1808, when that very venerable institution

* Ludovicus a Paterno Bzovius Clement VII. (quest-quindecim) and many others.

Digitized by Google

was abolished" (29th July, 1883), and to afford this pleasure the tale of victims is added. Neither is the hope of reviving inquisitorial murders confined to newspapers; in his notorious syllabus of 8th December, 1864, Pius IX. stigmatizes it as a grievous error to suppose that "the Church has not the right to use force" (Sect. V. § 24), and "that the ecclesiastical authority ought not to exercise this prerogative without the permission and assent of the civil government" (Sect. V. § 20). Joachim dei Segni, while archbishop of Imola, published cordial approval of the syllabus; as Leo XIII. he in many circulars (encyclica) lamented that he is not allowed to use "force", by this word both popes could only mean re-establishment of the Inquisition to kill and destroy such people as decline to consider either the "Lord our God" (Dominus noster Deus papa).

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XIV

JESUITS

Speaking lies in hypocrisy having their conscience seared with a hot iron.

ANOTHER opponent to amendment of the corrupt and corrupting (Chapters III. IV. V.) Church is the Society of Jesuits, constructed after many struggles and two inquisitorial condemnations, by Ignatius Loyola, who, although in his character there was much of the visionary, was yet practical, and perceived that those of papal trend lost, by secluding themselves in monasteries, their influence on the world. He aimed at gathering together a number of men who, bound by vows of implicit obedience to a central authority, should be capable of mixing in society, and, in unquestioning obedience to the chief, guide it in what direction he might command. Loyola's progress was at first slow, his inception of the idea dated between 1522 and '24, but it was not until 1540 that he and nine followers obtained sanction from Paul III.; even in granting it the pope manifested distrust by restricting its membership to sixty, though three years afterwards he was induced to withdraw the limitation. Paul's initiatory caution was apparently aroused by the very stringent rules as to obedience of each member of the order to its general, which intruded into the Romish Church another autocrat conceivably rival to the pope.

All members from their first affiliation as novices

Digitized by Google

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

are under ever watchful supervision, and in their turn must watch; each is a spy on all, and all on each. The Jesuit College at Rome can always turn to records concerning the actions and sayings and, by aid of the confessional, the thoughts of every member, * who (besides confession) is bound to lay open to his superior every desire and aspiration. In the matter of obedience he is very thoroughly broken in; the mode of holding his head and hands, his gait, position, direction of looking, tone of voice are regulated, and so in a given number of years the youth is moulded to be the blind instrument of a sodality to which he has sworn to devote himself entirely. No longer may he say I have a father, mother, sister, country; the verb must be in the past tense, "I had." He must obey not only in act, but by subjecting his will and personality, not his judgment—he ceases to have any. Innumerable are the exhortations concerning the completeness of subjection. "Real obedience is obedient in all things, even in those which evidently endanger health, life, honour and reputation, indeed virtue and the approbation of God; for to cast away conscience in this cause is in His sight a greater virtue; therefore he must obey even when partiality, injustice or evil intention evidently prompts the orders of the superior." (Spir. Exerc.) The regulations of Loyola, though very stringent, had not been formulated in quite so uncompromising a shape, as that into which they were moulded by the second general Lainez—the real author of the "Constitutiones Societatis Jesu," which placed in his hands absolute command over a drilled phalanx, answerable to no one else, not even to the pope.

Almost as soon as this Society felt itself secure, it began to be aggressive, which as well as its constitu-

* The same must be said of every person of whatever religion, whose activities are even in the smallest degree likely to affect the Society.

Digitized by Google

tion at once aroused distrust. Indeed, in 1558, two years after Lainez' accession to office, the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin denounced the body; in 1565 the University of Paris took legal action against it, the advocate, Pasquier, saying in his speech before the tribunal: "This sect can only produce division between pope and cardinals as between all other religious orders and themselves. There is no prince, no ruler tolerating it, who can secure his government against their attempts." A little further he said: "You who now tolerate the Jesuits, even you will reproach yourselves too late for your credulity, when you see the fatal consequences of your pliancy in the overthrow of order and of public tranquillity, not only in this kingdom, but throughout the Christian world, by the cunning, the artifices and intrigues of this new sect." The work by Antoine Arnauld, "La Théologie Morale des Jésuites," (1643) divulges their tenets and methods—it is an accurate and in no way libellous account; but the Society dreaded any revelation of its aims; a little later he also published "De la fréquente Communion," a work of much the same tendency. * These and "Augustinus" (1640), by Jansen, Bishop of Ypres, followed in 1656 by Pascal's "Lettres Provinciales" angered excessively the Jesuits, as also did the educational success of Port Royal, with which establishment both Pascal and Arnauld were connected. The Society violently attacked all these, nor was their rancour appeased until, in 1710, the very buildings of the ancient community were levelled with the ground, even the graves of long since deceased inmates violated and their sites obliterated. The story is too long and too well known to be

* Every jesuit preacher and almost every one of their writers, raved in France against these books, although twenty-four doctors of the Sorbonne, twenty-six bishops and some archbishops had stamped them with approval.

Digitized by Google

detailed here; it suffices to mention it as an example of jesuitical desire to lay all things under their feet. They proceeded in much the same way with various abbeys which they coveted, *e. g.*, those which the Emperor Ferdinand II. had, after taking them from the Protestants, given principally to the Benedictines, also with those of the Augustines, Citeaux and other communities.

Among the objects which Loyola put forward as an aid to the acceptation of his Society by Rome, was an extensive plan for conversion of the heathen beyond the limits of Europe. The Society established in Africa, America, the West Indies, Hindustan, Japan, China and elsewhere missions, worked entirely by Jesuits; Xavier being the prime mover in these efforts. While he directed his subordinates the work went fairly well, but hardly had death withdrawn his influence than a marked deterioration set in. The missionaries, satisfied with some outward act—*e.g.*, the sign of the Cross or genuflexion before an image, even though to the performer the meaning of neither was taught—reported the otherwise inexplicable celerity with which thousands were "converted" in a few minutes. To procure performance of such gestures many artifices were used, it being to the pecuniary advantage of the Society to have within its influence a large number of natives, for Gregory XIII. had, in 1574, granted it permission to trade in the lands they were supposed to be christianizing; therefore religious teaching was at once subordinated to acquisition of money. The history of the missions as given by Jesuit writers cannot be trusted, especially as a lurid light is thrown on their unveracity by a letter to Paul V. of a Franciscan missionary, Spoleto, accusing them not only of attending much more to their monetary interests than to proselytizing, but also of inciting the natives to hostilities against all others,

Digitized by Google

but their own order. Soon afterwards the conduct of the Jesuits so disgusted the Japanese that they killed some, drove others away and for many years would permit the residence of no European on their islands save the Dutch, whom they knew to be inimical to the company. From China several letters of missionary bishops not of the order, were received between 1590 and 1744, one of which may be quoted. "The Church in China deeply laments that it has been rather seduced than instructed by what the Jesuits have taught respecting the faith; they have kept the Cross of Christ out of sight and authorized customs absolutely pagan. Instead of christianizing idolaters, they have heathenized Christians. They have united God and Belial at the same table, in the same temple, at the same altar, and in the same sacrifices to the idols, prostrate themselves before them, present incense to them and erect the cross in the same temple as Dagon; the idolatry of such rites being evaded by a pretext of the Jesuits directing the inward attention to a cross carried secretly and concealed at the time of their idol-worship." In Hindustan much success was, if we credit his boasts, obtained by Nobili, beginning with the lowest caste and the pariahs; but to gain over the two upper, he adopted Brahminical dress, rites and even in a large measure doctrine. Withdrawing entirely from the lower grades, he taught that a Jesuit is a peculiarly sacred emanation of Brahma, procuring the fabrication in Hindustani of a document stating that the Jesuits were the lineal descendants of that God. These doings were severely censured by four popes between the years 1645 and 1744, and by five others a little less strongly. The acts of the Jesuits in Paraguay are exposed by Palafox, Bishop of Angelopolis, in a letter (8th Jan. 1649) to Innocent X., in which he accuses them of debasing Christianity, of mingling the crucifix with obscene images and of

Digitized by Google

debauching rather than elevating the people. The Society in those lands persecuted and attempted to kill the saintly bishop; the pope, unable to protect him there, translated him to a European see, and the jesuit missionaries were the better able to enslave the Guaranas with much profit and little mercy.

Ostensibly the object of the Society in obtaining permission to trade was to defray the cost of the missions; the real incentive was that converts might be made to labour very cheaply, that though a small stipend might be given, they would be to all intent and purpose slaves. Accordingly mines were opened, plantations, distilleries, factories etc. were set up. The grant to trade supplied what were called missions with a very easily abused leverage; accordingly, soon after this concession, Jesuits from mission stations, especially such as had engaged on both Atlantic shores in the negro slave-trade, were continually returning very rich to Europe. Cardinal Tournon was sent (1710) by Clement XI. to China to enquire into the condition of that station. The Jesuits imprisoned and poisoned him at Macao; but not before he had reported that "they lend on usury to the natives at from 25 per cent to 27 per cent and more, even up to 100 per cent."—Bishop Palafox wrote (1649) to Innocent X.: "What other order has carried on within the Church money-lending at high interest, and opened within their houses butchers' and other shops for driving unseemly traffic with the natives?" At this time the income derived from Paraguay by Spain was very small; jesuit missionaries were obtaining yearly, from rents and by working the natives in factories and plantations, one and a half million pezzi = 3,750,000 scudi. The bishop also writes of much grief in Seville, where the company had induced widows, orphans, the poorer clergy and other small folk to invest with it 400,000 dollars and then be-

Digitized by Google

came bankrupt, pleading in the legal action benefit and immunity of clergy. The Marquis Ossuno assessed the annual income of the Jesuits in Spain at two and a half million of francs, besides large mobilia. At St. Pierre, in Martinique, the jesuit father La Valette had set up in the house of the order a large business establishment, having correspondents in the principal European, chiefly French, centres. Backed by the credit of the Society he monopolized nearly all the business of the Antilles. In 1755 he drew large bills on Messrs. Leonci and Gouffre of Marseilles. It was war time and the vessels with cargoes from Martinique were captured; the bills could not be met, the merchants applied to P. Saci, director in France of jesuit missions, who said he could do nothing without the General's sanction, but suggested that the gentlemen might take out the amount (three million francs) in masses. The office of General then vacant was awaiting an election; delay was endless. When at length Ricci was appointed he ordered Saci to pay nothing; the firm was bankrupt. The affair dragged on for years, and created not only in France, but in all Europe great scandal, as it probably was the largest swindle that had as yet been perpetrated.

On all mission stations the Jesuits busy themselves in villifying and thwarting the efforts of all others, and herein have the fervent co-operation of Leo XIII. In his circular (Encyclica) of 3rd Dec. 1886, this peace-pope described protestant missionaries as "men full of deceit." "People busied in enlarging the rule of the Prince of Darkness" and other bellicose epithets. Taking thence their cue, ultramontane journals under the control of the pope or rather of his jesuit masters, call them "the Devil's apostles," "English bonzes," and teach their pupils the same language. Of course, other missionaries greatly obstruct the jesuit ones in conducting their work in such modes as must have

Digitized by Google

been pursued to enrich the order so enormously in the space of comparatively few years; they resent that any outside their order should have means of noticing their doings.

Money, however ardently pursued, is less the object of jesuit desire than such influence in all states as shall enable the company to sway their actions into courses advantageous to itself. With this object it has many and, for their especial objects, well-trained teachers of seminaries and schools. In most Catholic countries the education of youth is almost entirely in their hands, indeed that of girls completely so; a danger if such country should in the future oppose some desire of the Society. Another step to power is the capture of nearly every confessional, the elimination of almost all non-jesuit directors and the substitution of their own members. Of course this was more especially important in regard to influential persons. To facilitate this, penalties for sin are made light, and by a system called casuistry, the prohibitions of the Decalogue and the injunctions of Christ are so glossed and explained away, that evil is transformed into good and thus "we may indulge our most alluring inclinations even if they be not the most correct; moreover, we may choose the worst when inclination is evenly divided between the two" (de Sala). "I am astonished at the genius of the learned Diana. Only the envious can deny that his acumen has made many views probable which formerly were not so. If, therefore, these previously inadmissible views have now been made probable, it follows that people acting upon them do not now sin although formerly they did so" (Caramuel).

PROBABILISM. These phrases quoted from casuists, especially the use of the word "probable," require some explanation. According to casuistry, it is possible for any one committing some evil deed to

Digitized by Google

purposely assume a tone of thought or a demeanour, which shall minimize or annul the sinfulness of the act; but he must be careful to adopt such as do, according to jesuit views, have that effect. To select them the man intending to steal or to murder must consult personally or by reading some "grave doctor," who has given a "probable opinion" that by adding an hypocrisy to the contemplated crime, he may escape its burden. There are a great many "grave doctors," (all Jesuits, for none of that company would apply the term to one outside the order,) their views are divergent, therefore he proposing to break a law of God must be very careless if he fail to find an opinion subverting that law and permitting (in jesuitry), commission of the offence. "I perceive the brilliancy of Divine providence in furnishing such variety of views, that one may easily support the Christian yoke.... By Divine providence; we can at the present time offer to people several modes of acting and behaving, so that whether they choose one opinion or the other they will always be in the right (Escobar). When such a man in the confessional receives reproof for some act and can point to an opinion of this or another casuist, that it is no sin or a very slight one, the confessor is bound to withdraw his censure and pronounce the malefactor innocent.

DIRECTING THE INTENTION. One may commit any evil provided it be done not for the pleasure of sinning, but for gaining a desired result. So acting, one must fix the mind on some permissible deed, or persuade oneself that the aim is good. (By "good" the Jesuit always means advantageous.)

MENTAL RESERVATION AND AMPHIBOLOGIA. One may attach to words a meaning different to that which they are intended to and do convey, or one may mentally add unspoken words, reversing the meaning of those pronounced.

Digitized by Google

QUIETISM inculcates that the perpetrator of some iniquity, by avoiding consideration of its evil and keeping his conscience calm, may render it venial or even meritorious.

UTILISM. If an injury or inconvenience can be avoided, or an advantage gained, by some wrongful deed, such is permissible.

CLANDESTINISM. Even a very bad action becomes at worst a mere venial offence, if, being perfectly concealed, there be no scandal. *

FORMALISM. Not the conscience nor the soul determine the right or wrong of acts, but only their outward aspect and appearance.

These are the chief foundations of works palliating —indeed one may say advising sin, by some seventy or more grave doctors. To quote more than a few is impossible. We begin with psychical states; many more aphorisms on each of the subjects might be quoted.

Repentance is divided into attrition and contrition, the distinction varies in different grave doctors; the former is described as an imperfect phase of the latter. Those whose reason has not been obscured by tangled subtleties may take it that attrition is mere fright of what hereafter the sin may entail; the latter is true sorrow at having committed an offence against God. "Contrition is not at all necessary, not even at death." "Repentance is not at all necessary to obtaining the full benefit of the Eucharist; in fact it is an impediment" (Escobar, Fagundus, Granada).

Loving God. "Be not alarmed at the command, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy soul and with all thy strength; it does not really mean that. What Christ really meant, is that you

* This is especially designed for the guidance of confessors in their conduct towards women. It is for these that Liguori invented the aphorism, "si non caste tamen caute."

Digitized by Google

should not hate Him" (Baunez). "It is enough, if we love Him at the end of life" (Vasquez). "It is probable that we may be condemned to do so once in five years" (Henriquez). "To elect to hate God may help to gain eternal life" (Arriaga).

Ignorance. "Not to know that there is a God must be considered a great benefit and favour; for sin being essentially an affront to the Divine Being, take away the knowledge of God and it necessarily follows that there is no offence, no sin is committed and there is no punishment to be feared" (Card. Sfrondate). "There can be no sin where there is no knowledge of God" (Pelton).

Irreverence. "It seems probable that no attention at all—neither internal, formal nor virtual—is required from one repeating the office; we ought to lay it down as a principle that internal attention, that is to say the application of the mind and soul to God, is unnecessary" (Filliutius). "An evil thought while hearing mass—such as looking lustfully on a woman—is not against the command, therefore a man who hears mass with such thoughts in his mind fulfils the command, provided he be reticent enough to assume an outward appearance of decency" (Busenbaum). "One present at mass from vanity, or with hopes to steal, fulfils, nevertheless, the precepts, though accompanied by evil circumstances" (Sanchez). The Romish Church asserts that the wafer given at the Eucharist is Christ whole and entire; thus does the Jesuit juggle with Him: "Is it allowable to give an unprepared sinner, though not known as such, an unconsecrated wafer? Some say it is, and some that it is only permissible on condition that the priest hide the unconsecrated wafer so skilfully that none can see or worship it, and some consider that it is better to pretend putting a consecrated wafer into the penitent's mouth. I have

Digitized by Google

done this several times without causing scandal" (Escobar).

Lying. "A promise does not bind, if, when making it, you had not the intention of binding yourself" (Escobar). In using amphibologia the first rule is, that whenever the meaning of words permits of several interpretations, it is not a lie to use them in what sense the speaker chooses to adopt, although so framing them that he to whom they are addressed must take them in an opposite sense. Also without lying, one may use words that are not ambiguous and do not lend themselves to the desired sense, unless with the secret addition of some concealed words; *e.g.*—"Someone alone, or with others, may ask about a certain act; he may swear that he did not do it, though in reality he did, for in his mind he may, while swearing, think of something else which he did not do or of some other day when he did not do it. Acting so, he does not lie or perjure himself; he only does not speak that particular truth which his hearers understand it to be and which is expressed by his words." Then follows justification of a lie in denying committed patricide, with the same mental reservation, and "astuteness of this kind is very useful in concealing that which we wish to hide, whether theft, murder or anything else" (Sanchez). Filliutius, adding "because the end justifies the means," further on asks: "What prudence is to be observed in ambiguity? Firstly this: if one intend to use clear words, one must silently insert a *restrictio mentalis;* for instance, if he wish to swear that he did not do a certain thing, he may manage thus (the restriction is in brackets), 'I swear that I did not do it (to-day).' Secondly by this formula, 'I swear that (I say) I did not do it.'" Any one who has verbally sworn without the idea of swearing need not keep the oath, for he has not really sworn, but only played at

Digitized by Google

swearing" (Busenbaum). "If any one is unjustly or by force compelled to promise something—*e.g.*, to pay a sum of money, this may be done: 'I swear that I will pay it.' After that he may at his choice either pay it to him who extorted the oath or to some one else who will immediately return it to him" (Bauncy). "One may swear by Jesus or by Christ, because those names may not mean the Redeemer, but some other person; for Jesus was a common name among the Jews and even Christ is in Holy Writ applied to other persons" (Filliutius).

Theft. "An honourable man to whom begging is repugnant may take secretly what is necessary if he can obtain it in no other way" (Moult). Most casuists say that little thefts are venial, and ask what is small, what large, after pretty wide estimates. Escocobar, Lessius, Sanchez and others advise children to rob their parents, servants their masters, whenever they feel dissatisfied with what they are allowed or earn. "A son doing any unsalaried work for his father is recommended to help himself to rather more than what he thinks his wage ought to be" (Laymann).

Cheating. "If a purveyor think that too high a duty has been levied on his wares, he may add to the legally regulated price, or may sell by false weight and measure; should a magistrate ask if he have done either, he may deny on oath, taking care while doing so, mentally to reserve that he has given as much as he was obliged for the sum paid" (Escobar). Also Filliutius advises false weights and measures and the adulteration of food-stuffs, adding a caution that this latter "should not be done too manifestly." Druggists, making up a prescription, are recommended by Escobar and Salas to substitute a cheaper for a more expensive drug and to charge it at the higher price.

Fraud. "A bankrupt is fully justified in secreting

Digitized by Google

and keeping back as much of his creditor's money as will enable him to live comfortably, although the debts for which he has failed may have been fraudulently, even criminally contracted, only in that last case he should not retain quite so much" (Lessius). Should the bankrupt die, "his widow and children, being called before a judge, may deny the whole, because they have not been asked about any specific matter . . . if they have managed so astutely that they cannot be convicted. . . ." Lest, however, they should unwittingly perjure themselves, "they should consult some good casuist or experienced confessor who will tell them some irrelevant question, on which, in answering, they can fix their thoughts" (Baunez).

Venal Justices. "If a judge find that a cause is as probable on one side as the other, but one of the litigants be his friend, he may decide in that sense that will most benefit his friend. Aye more, he may for this purpose use one probabilism as guide to his judgment and another in giving verdict—provided that no scandal be caused" (Greg. of Valencia). Escobar quotes and agrees with many casuists that judges may receive bribes. "To bribe a judge, one may give his son a benefice" (Filliutius). "A judge may disregard the most probable and decide for the least probable in order to benefit friend or relative" (Decatillus). "If a judge cannot be bribed by money, presents or benefices, it is permissible to suborn his concubine to persuade him to give judgment in the desired sense" (Pallao, Escobar).

Blackmail. "If one know that a man has done something which may be punished by the State, he is justified in demanding money for silence; because foregoing the right to disclose is a benefit that may be estimated at money's worth" (Escobar).

Murder. "If some one attempt to deprive me of property or honour, I am justified in challenging him

Digitized by Google

or in accepting a challenge, and also in secretly killing him; for thus I avoid not only the danger, but also the sin of a duel" (Sanchez). "Secret murder is not traitorous, even though done cunningly and from behind" (Escobar). "Some one may design to injure me by false accusation to a prince, judge or other influential person; in such cases I am justified in secretly killing the individual... the same must be said if the impeachment be true, provided the crime threatened with exposure be not known to anyone else" (Lessius, Baunez). "If a cleric have sinned with a woman and she boast of the matter, he may kill her in order to avoid scandal" (Stattler, Amicus, Caramnel and others). "Taking money to assault, beat or kill some one is not a sin" (Longuet). "But to the hired murderer the stipulated sum must be paid" (Laymann).

Patricide. Casuists appear (p. 227) to consider this a very commonplace matter; a few more words may be added. "A son who while drunk has murdered his father, may afterwards rejoice over the deed on account of the inheritance.... Whatever acts you may commit when drunk, even though previously planned, are not in my opinion sins, for they are but the result of the previous fault. If, when the wine with which you intend to get drunk has been drawn, and before the acts (*e.g.*, patricide or other murder) be done, you repent of the cause whence they arise, you are not guilty of them either really or formally, for you have been penitent of that cause which has rendered them involuntary" (Escobar and Beccano).

Regicide. "A prince by right of succession or of election... may not be murdered by a private person unless a cardinal or a leader (jesuit general) has decided that it is permissible to kill an emperor or even a pope *(let this last be noted)* to defend oneself" (Delrio). Philopater says all and any Christian prince, if he diverge from Catholic (*i.e.* Romish) be-

Digitized by Google

lief, must be dethroned and driven out of all Christian lands." "Christians must not suffer a heretic prince, if he try to lead his subjects into infidelity (distrust of Jesuits of Rome), but of this the pope is judge also as to whether such a king is to be dethroned" (Bellarmine). "Such a king is the worst criminal of all mankind and must, according to the directions of the Holy Ghost, be killed, he shall not rule over Christians (*i.e.*, papists). Now every king is heretic who interferes in Church matters, does not drive him whom a bishop calls heretic out of the realm, who calls in question any decree of council, does not destroy heretical books, allows assemblies of heretics, declines to accept and publish papal decrees and does not arrange his laws according to Church (Romish) statutes" (Rosseus Rainold). Mariana (1605), the chief jesuit apostle of regicide, exulted over the crime of Jacques Clement, teaching that a subject may kill his king provided some grave doctor have told him that such monarch is a tyrant; he says there is more glory and heroism in an open attack, but more prudence in artifice, he rather depreciates poison as less certain than the knife, its use, however, is permissible. * Lessius tried to reassure princes by telling them that "they are not in danger if people consult a grave doctor," which is a covert threat that if the ruler does not obey jesuit dictation, the grave doctor will contrive his assassination. La Chaise, jesuit confessor to Louis XIV., when on his death-bed warned the king thus: "Sire, I beg of you as a grace to take as confessor one of my Society, its members are deeply interested in its success. Should what they

* Eulogy of king-murder is not confined to Jesuits. A few days after Henri III. was stabbed (1598) Sixtus V. sang a blasphemous pæan on the crime, in which he compared the difficulty of believing that a monarch could be killed in the midst of his guards by a simple monk, with obstacles to faith in birth by a virgin.

Digitized by Google

might consider a rebuff occur, it cannot answer for them all, and a misdeed is so easily arranged." Louis, strongly impressed, imparted this advice to Maréchal, surgeon-in-chief, who thought it his duty to warn the head valet and the royal apothecary.

Lubricity. A subject which, if possible, should have been avoided, must, however, receive a slight notice —viz., casuists' dealings with crimes of uncleanness. These of every possible sort, even such as, until having studied casuistry, would seem impossible, are excused, especially if committed by father-confessors and Jesuits. The most abhorrent actions are specified, and are even committed by confessors and other priests, as jesuit discourses and the records of criminal trials where popery is predominant show. *

He who desires it can with ease verify the statements, and learn a great deal more by consulting in any large library works on casuistry; these, called moral theologies, Christian ethics, etc., are given to young men preparing for the priesthood in seminaries; such is the best possible method of procuring a corrupt clergy skilled in hypocrisy under the name of clandestinism, and inculcating the easiest way of producing confusion of right and wrong, bewilderment of conscience and loss of faith in God.

Besides substituting for Gospel doctrine the absolutely contrary propositions, probabilism and the other ways of inculcating sin above described, Jesuits teach idolatry, especially in the form of worshipping dolls to which the name Mary is attached. To these people also are due the many appearances of the Queen of Heaven in France, also the patronage of the Church by Joseph; the newspaper vending and subscription, advertising St. Anthony of Padua; the setting up of the "Omnipotente Tessoriera del Dio"

* "Aktenmässige Darstellung," Jacobi Marellis S. J. Amores; also Liguori, Gaume, Baunez, Sanchez, etc., etc.

Digitized by Google

in Naples, clamouring for constant donations and an occasional golden and bejewelled crown. Likewise they support the absurdities of witchcraft,* for protection against which, bits of cloth to wear between the shoulders, bunches of flowers, buttons, brooches etc., that have undergone some form of incantation, are sold by them at such prices as the credulous can be induced to pay.

But perhaps, when compared with their conduct, the most prodigious item of their teaching is unquestioning obedience to the pope, that is to say obedience of other people; their own stands on a very different basis—for instance, Paul IV. ordered a certain addition to the services and restricted the tenure of the generalship to three years, a colorable concession in their affiliated churches was instituted; even this was withdrawn on the pope's death, and Lainez was immediately made general for life. Pius V. insisted on its reintroduction; Borgia, the then general, promised it as soon as the breviary could be altered; but the pope did not live long enough to see this completed. Paul V. was about to condemn the jesuit doctrine concerning Grace; the general, Aquaviva, told him that if he issued such a bull a hundred thousand jesuit pens would attack it and that in a manner to compromise the chair. Urban VIII., Clement IX., X., XI. interdicted their trading, they took not the slightest notice. The first-named also procured condemnation by the Inquisition at Rome of Bauny's notorious book; the Paris Jesuits instantly issued a fresh edition, while the Spanish ones wrote insultingly, both of the pope and of the Romish Inquisition. Nine popes condemned the jesuit performances in China (Innocent X., Clement IX., X., XI., XII., Innocent XI., XII., XIV., Benedict XIII.). The Jesuits simply said the bulls were forgeries, they imprisoned at Macao and else-

* Delrio, S.J., Disquisitiones Majica.

Digitized by Google

where, also poisoned several of the papal envoys (1710), and against the decrees of Clement XI. and XII. appealed to the Emperor of China and accepted his judgment on a theological topic, in preference to that of the pope's; this judgment being that the rites with idols, joss-sticks pagoda bells etc., were not in any way idolatrous. The reader may now be asked to refer back to p. 230 where a noteworthy remark of Delrio is quoted. Sixtus V. insisted that certain jesuit doctrines should be modified and that the name of the company should be changed. The Jesuit Bellarmine (afterwards cardinal) prophesied that he would not outlive the year; he died within the prescribed period. Cardinal Castegna had zealously assisted Sixtus in organizing a plan for those changes, and at the conclave of that year was, to the great annoyance of the Jesuits, chosen pope (Urban VII.); he only survived the election eleven days. Innocent XIII. endeavoured to prevent the Jesuits pursuing a certain course, again did Bellarmine raise his prophetic or directing voice; at the predicted time Clement ceased to exist. Innocent also dissolved the Chinese jesuit missions and prohibited the admission of any new members into the order; he survived this decree but very few months, dying in 1724. Clement XIII. was petitioned by France, Spain and Portugal to abolish the Society; he declined, setting forth his reasons in the encyclical of 1765. But those kingdoms continued to urge their desire so strongly, that towards the end of 1768 he evidently was on the point of yielding; he therefore died on 3rd Feb. 1769. His successor, Clement XIV., 1769—74, after carefully considering those petitions and jesuit practices, issued the bull "Redemptor" abolishing the Society; he imprisoned some of the most recalcitrant members and had the general, Ricci, closely watched.*

* The Society would not be dissolved, being protected in certain States—notably in Russia; thus it wrote: "The illustrious Catherine

Digitized by Google

At once virulent calumny was rife, rumours were set afoot that the pope was insane, as also was a prophecy that he would die a year after signing (21st July, 1773) the bull. Cardinal Archbishop de Bernis wrote to the court at Paris several despatches speaking of these libels, saying in one (7th Sept. 1774), that Clement's mind was perfectly clear and bright, he also mentioned constant threats of dagger and poison. The prophecies of the Society were not so punctually fulfilled as usual, due perhaps to causes mentioned in the next few lines. When the pope was signing the bull, he said to an influential person sitting with him at the table: "At last the suppression is accomplished.... I do not regret it, and were it not already done, I would do it now. *Ma questa suppressione mi sara la morte.*" Clement, up to that time a vigorous man, began almost at once to fail; in April, and again in June he was very ill; he knew he was being poisoned and took antidotes. A day or two after the last attack, papers were attached to the walls of St. Peter and the Vatican, bearing the letters I. S. S. S. V., which Clement himself thus interpreted: "In Septembre sacra sede vacante." He died in that month 1774.

Regarding this death, de Bernis and the Spanish envoy wrote to their respective governments, that it was undoubtedly caused by jesuit poison. On the other hand, the physician Salicetti inspected the viscera and reported that they shewed no signs of poison.*

most wisely used on this occasion the right of every ruler to make her subjects happy, by forbidding the Jesuits to obey the pope." The phrase is strange in the mouth of those who constantly assert that a ruler's duty is to make their subjects miserable or to kill them unless they "obey the pope."

* At that date toxicology was an almost unknown science; several physicians eminent in that study assure the writer that merely looking at the organs cannot indicate the absence of poison. Salicetti's life would not have been worth a month's purchase had he asserted death by poison.

Digitized by Google

Yet the mode of attack, the constant thirst, gastric pains, burning and constriction of the throat plainly indicate irritant poison, as too does Salicetti's report of the visceral conditions. All these, described in the Spanish ambassador's despatch, are, an expert assures us, very characteristic of arsenical poisoning.

The bull "Redemptor" was in its wording one of the most stringent ever issued, it forbade, under severe penalties, that it should "ever be rescinded, glossed, or its meaning modified or explained away." It only remained in force for forty years, for when Napoleon, his run of luck exhausted, was sent to Elba, Pius VII. returned (24th May, 1814) to Rome, and seventy-five days later issued the bull "Solicitudo Omnium" reversing that of Clement and reinstating the Society. Since that date, and even more markedly since Pius IX. refuged his frightened personality under jesuit guard at Gaeta, the papacy has become the mere stalking-horse of jesuitry. There are now in Rome a white pope (elected at the conclave) and a black one (chosen at the Jesuit College). The white venturing to disobey the black one must indeed be a very bold man.

Many Jesuits have taken orders in the Church of England, and many Anglicans after ordination have joined the Society. Such persons easily find in casuistry sundry means of foreswearing themselves; they then proceed to betray the mother whom they have sworn to defend, and to introduce inside the churches such practices as are characteristic rather of the cult of Numa or of Ovid than of the apostles and fathers; while outside the buildings the sort of morality and probity they inculcate, can best be gathered from casuistry. To this set of Jesuito-Ritualists, Pusey belonged. * "The Little Liturgy" by a Jesuit is dedicated

* He always denied this, but never, as far as we know, told any one behind which mental reservation or amphibologia he sheltered himself.

Digitized by Google

to him "in grateful remembrance of many spiritual blessings"—an acknowledgment no one of the Society would make to a man outside the craft. Newman, who afterwards became a cardinal, was, if possible, even more betainted by jesuit methods, inasmuch as Whately accused him of "garbling and distorting," and of concocting a "tissue of deliberate and artful misrepresentations, consisting of the *suppressio veri* so contrived as to amount to the *suggestio falsi*—the kind of lie which Swift justly calls the worst—a lie guarded." * These two are by no means the only, but simply the more conspicuous retrogressists, who, contemning oath and avocation, strove to beguile the English Church again into the hierophancy of ignorance, corruption and idolatry, from which she freed herself three and a half centuries ago.

* "The Anglican Career of Cardinal Newman," E. A. Abbott, V. II., p. 58.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XV

INFALLIBILITY

If a man knoweth not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the Church of God.

THE cabal of Romish sacerdotalists which met several times between 1543 and 1565, wrongfully assumed the name of an œcumenical (general) council. Caring little or nothing for the evils that deformed the Church and disgusted nearly all Europe, it expended its energies in opposing any real reform, not only of its practices, but also of beliefs or superstitions that centuries of accumulated papal variants or contradictions of Scripture had brought about. Ardent determination to oppose everything done or suggested by Protestants, led them to crystallize their credence into a number of formulæ or canons, and, with the usual Romish love for damning people, to curse all who differed from its peculiarly incongruous phrases. Yet the Tridentine did not usher in a peaceful time—the French Huguenots had to be massacred, German and Netherland Protestants to be burnt and tortured, the great Armada to be lustrated and subsidised, the Thirty Years' War to be kindled and sustained; over these matters the reader need not now be delayed. The end of the 18th century was for all lands a troublous time; we need not, however, go further back than the death of Pius VII., when the result of restoring the Jesuits was evidenced by an outbreak of Romish intolerance towards the Scrip-

Digitized by Google

tures; Leo XII. (1823—29) emitting circulars which, by hatred for correct, non-annotated translations of Holy Writ, betray their jesuit origin. The encyclica of 5th May, 1824, condemned, under the name, "tolerantism," any liberty of thought and conscience; it anathematized bible-societies, and prohibited diffusion among the people of the Sacred Volume in a language they can understand, calling it "a fatal practice, a godless invention, which by means of a perverted interpretation* makes of the Bible a gospel of the devil." On 2nd July, 1826, a circular was addressed to the clergy of Poitiers, "Everyone who separates himself from the Romish Catholic Church, however blameless otherwise his life, has, on account of this one crime, because he is thereby excluded from the unity of Christ, no part in the eternal life. God's wrath hangs over him." Leo's Maestro del Ralazzo pronounced, and the office shows that papal sanction must have been procured, that the same doom awaited anyone who retained even the smallest modicum of Church property. The action of the English Government contrasts strongly with the fierce intolerance of these circulars. On 13th April, 1829, less than two months after Leo's death, Parliament passed the Catholic Emancipation Bill, doubtless a rightful measure, for intolerance is wrong; yet surely it might have insisted that a commensurate amount of forbearance should be extended to Protestants in Rome and in other countries.

On July 7th, 1830, the papal nuncio in Paris, Lambruschini, induced Charles X. to publish the five ordin-

* That bible-societies circulate perverted versions of the Scriptures is self-evidently untrue; that the Romish Church in any way represents the one Will of the Saviour, "the unity of Christ," is also not the fact; the Eastern and the Protestant Churches are at least as numerous as the Romish. It is useful to note that possessing something the pope or his palace master may covet, entails in Romish idea the same fate as the gravest sin.

Digitized by Google

ances, which immediately led to the revolution of that month. The event produced great excitement in Italy, in the midst of which Cappellari (Feb. 2nd, 1831) won his election in the Vatican. Under his government Rome and its dependent territories were in a terrible state, for Gregory XVI. endeavoured to stifle all ideas of mental and bodily liberty, by many executions and imprisonments; the nation was held in subjection by foreign troops, heavy exactions for their maintenance being wrung from the people. In the sixteen years of his misrule business was almost at a standstill; no railways were permitted to approach the city; the highways were almost impassable, murders and every kind of ruffianism were frequent and unpunished, for the police were chiefly employed in watching for symptoms of heresy. During those years the public debt had risen from twenty to forty million scudi, several sources of income had been mortgaged for many years. The annual deficit being half a million, Rothschild would only lend absolutely necessary money at 65 per cent. When this pope died, there were six thousand prisoners, chiefly accused of religious thought, and an incalculable number of exiles and fugitives.

At the next conclave (16th June, 1846), Maria Mastai Feretti won the election. Never did potentate so easily and rapidly gain the affection of his subjects. This was not difficult; he had but to reverse in civil government almost everything his predecessor had done. A general amnesty, release of thousands of prisoners, recall of exiles, raised the hopes of an ever-excitable people; wherever the pope appeared he was greeted with shouts of "Eviva, Pio Nono!" Also a strong factor in producing this enthusiasm was the promise of a constitution and the appointment of a Cabinet partly composed of laymen; but a little closer acquaintance showed it to be so bound up with excep-

Digitized by Google

tions, so hampered with provisions that everything the committee might recommend or vote, only became valid after examination and approval by the College of Cardinals; in fact, what was by one hand given was by the other taken away, especially that o'ermastering desire to be no longer governed by priests was from the Romans withheld. The pope was attempting the impossible—viz., to govern liberally a people whom he mentally endeavoured to enslave by prohibition of all thought, save in one particular direction, as witness his accession circular, a verbose lamentation on times "in which the most violent and dreadful war is inflamed against the interests of catholicism by those who, united in infamous associations, turning the ear from the truth, are bent on bringing forth from darkness every species of monstrous opinion," and so on, followed by diatribes on the heinous offence of faithfully translating the Holy Scriptures against "the perverse instruction in science and philosophy." People failed to understand a liberty which precluded the pursuit of knowledge, watched inimically political utterances, and indeed forbade independent thought; they naturally became restless. Pius, in alarm, was sometimes yielding to popular desires, sometimes negotiating with Austria for their suppression by armed forces. His vacillation between two incompatibilities was interpreted as treachery; he lost his popularity as rapidly as he had gained it; the exultant cry of 1846—7 was changed into a query with negative answer: "Eviva Pio? No! No!" Tumults and disorders followed. Austria sent an army into the Papal States, thus arousing the jealousy or "just susceptibility" of France. The pope was virtually a prisoner of the people till in the night of the 24th November, 1848, he fled to Gaeta. Of course, Italy and more especially Rome were deluged with much swearing and many excommunications, not to be removed until the

Digitized by Google

people dutifully returned to the "fold of Peter." But they somehow in their minds identified that fold with a dungeon in St. Angelo and were not conscious of any inclination in that direction; on the contrary, on the 15th February, 1849, they declared papal government at an end and proclaimed the Roman Republic.

In the meantime, at Gaeta, Pius was begging France, Austria, Spain, Naples and others to again impose him on the unwilling Romans; the second of these occupied Bologna and Ancona, the first Rome, which, ruled over by a committee of cardinals, was made to feel by many executions and imprisonments how blessed a thing is sacerdotal temporal power. Louis Napoleon, then President of the French Republic, begged for some mitigation of the severity; the pope replied with his habitual "non possumus." At length, when the Romans had been cowed, Pius IX. well guarded by French rifles, returned (1st April, 1850) to Rome, where he ruled* under dictation of Cardinal Antonelli and of the Jesuit College. For during his fourteen months' exile in Gaeta, he had been thoroughly schooled, probably also intimidated by that company, and was completely under its sway; and for the rest of his pontificate was little more than its tool, though in describing his acts, it will be necessary to say the pope did this or that. Mariolatry has always been to Jesuits an alluring form of idolatry, and at Gaeta they found Pius greatly inclined in the same direction. One of his names was Mary (in the Italian form, Maria), and he appears to have imagined her to be his sponsor; likewise, he attributed recovery from epilepsy to her influence, as also his success at the Conclave. Accordingly, soon after his flight to Gaeta he sent out (2nd July, 1849) a circular—a feeler of episcopal subservience, while the Jesuit College let it be known that the

* Farini's letter to Mr. Gladstone gives a heart-rending picture of Rome at this period.

Digitized by Google

pope would regard with favour such as petitioned him to declare dogmatically worship of "The Queen of Heaven," that is, that Mary was born in some ill-explained miraculous way and is the most potent entity in Heaven. About five years, during which the subservience of bishops was further tested, were allowed to elapse. Several women, either hysterical or prompted by emissaries of the college, alleged sundry apparitions of Mary; stories from La Salette were abundantly circulated. A congregation was appointed to consider the matter. Bishops in all parts were directed to record their opinions by letter; none seem to have been so imprudent as to return a negative, four doubted the competency of such a meeting as was proposed to decide, thirty-two that the time was opportune. In August 1854 Pius invited certain bishops to a congregation in Rome to vote whether this phantasy should be decreed "de fide." The artifice was both simple and skilful, for the pope had in the answers to his circular the names of all whose voices would be adverse, and of these very few were bidden.*

The result, therefore, was a foregone conclusion—on 8th Dec., 1854, the apostolic letter "Ineffabilis Deus" declared belief in an apocryphal Anna having, as a virgin, born a female child to be necessary to salvation. In each of the thirty-two sections which make up the document, are many perversions of Gospel and historic annals; indeed, except some commonplace, it is difficult to find a true statement in the whole letter. The twenty-eighth paragraph threatens unbelievers with the damnation so liberally dispensed by popes, the thirtieth with the anger of the apostles. Some remarks may be here interpolated. Had such a doctrine

* Among the omitted was Sibaur, Archbishop of Paris. Napoleon III. demanded his inclusion, which Pius, only held in the chair by French soldiers, could not refuse.

Digitized by Google

been either true or necessary to salvation, some trace of it would be found in the Gospels. Christ himself denies any special sanctity to the fleshly instruments of His Incarnation (Luke V. 27). Mariolatry was not intruded into the Romish cult till near the middle of the fifth century—even then it did not reach the extravagancies of Pius, which, had they been any part of Christianity, would not have been left in abeyance for nearly 2000 years. One of Pius' decrees must here (see Chap. X.) be quoted as sufficiently showing how completely Mariolatry has in Romish idea superseded Christianity. "The whole groundwork of our faith is in the most Holy Virgin since God has placed the plenitude of all good in Mary, so that if there be in us any hope, any grace, any salvation we know that we have received them from Her, because such is the will of Him who has ordained that we should have all from Mary." Declaring in St. Peter's this new dogma, Pius hardily asserted that in so doing he was fulfilling the wish of all Christendom; he also seized the opportunity of imitating as closely as possible heathen precedents, by placing on the image of the Queen of Heaven a jewelled crown.

A few years previously Pius had taken a step towards England of no little import. Encouraged by the success of the Anglo-Jesuits, Newman, Pusey, Hurrell Froude and others, he, 29th Sept., 1850, divided this country into a number of Romish Sees and appointed to them bishops of that cult; this was entirely against the laws of the realm.* Great indignation was expressed at the time. Lord John Russell (Prime Minister) declared that "neither in nor out of the House would any Englishman submit to the insult." Blomfield, Bishop of London, replying to clergymen who had complained, wrote: "The appointment of bishops .... constituted a virtual denial of

* 26 Hen. cap. 14; Eliz. cap. 1.

Digitized by Google

the legitimate authority of the British Sovereign and of the English Episcopate, a denial also of the validity of our orders, an assertion of spiritual jurisdiction over the whole Christian people of this realm." * But advisers of the pope knew better than did Englishmen themselves the ease with which the nation forgets and condones outrage.

Another trial of strength may be recalled to the reader's memory: forcibly abducting and baptising against the will of the protesting parents the eight-years-old Jewish boy, Mortara; here need be mentioned only the notorious "syllabus" (it is more especially commented on in the sequel), it really was a test of the flabby resistance that might be offered to the subversion of the whole constitution of the Romish Church which the Jesuit College was inducing Pius to undertake.

Although it is forbidden by canon-law to decree a new dogma unless on the proposition and by authority of an œcumenical council, Pius emitted the immaculate doctrine on his own authority, merely acquiesced in by a certain number of bishops. This was not oversight, but part of a carefully elaborated plot, having, as was intended, the result fully explained by a Viennese priest: "Pius IX., by his action on December 8th, 1854, did not theoretically define, but he did practically claim infallibility of the pope." Yet the requisite steps toward that goal could not be taken without very careful preparation, of something bearing a colourable likeness to œcumenicity. The word is Greek ("*οἰκουμενη*"), it connotes a meeting for the rule and governance of Christian opinion; taking those last words to mean not an assembly of persons biassed or interested exclusively in one direction, but of Christians who, on some questions holding variant views, might discuss the greater tenability of one or

* It was very much because he permitted the then pope (Innocent XI.) to parcel England into Romish bishoprics that James II. lost his crown.

Digitized by Google

the other. Thus, in the middle of the 1st century, those who adhered to the Mosaic law met at Jerusalem those who were in favour of mitigating its severity. In 316 the Emperor Constantine summoned, presided over and guided the arguments in favour of, or opposed to, the Arian form of belief. These are the models of œcumenical councils; but the Romish Church has wrongfully acquired the habit of denying the name "œcumenical" to all meetings which have decreed anything it considers detrimental to its interests, and in later centuries the still worse trick of calling together and packing assemblies with its own creatures, and then calling such one-sided gatherings "œcumenical councils"—so it was with the 4th Lateran, with the Tridentine, and to a considerable extent with that at Constance. No meeting called to discuss Christian views deserves the name "œcumenical" unless all considerable shades of opinion are there represented in proportion to the numbers of their adherents. A gathering of Romish cardinals, bishops, etc., has neither less nor more claim to the term "œcumenical" than has the meetings at Smalkald, at Worms, or English convocations of the present day, each representing but one stratum of religious thought. The object of the Jesuit College in arranging the 1869—70 meeting of the Vatican was as follows. Since the councils of Constance and of Basel the superiority of such gatherings over popes, or vice-versa, was not determined (see pp. 96, 98), but evidently a meeting called by the curia or forced on it from without would be a less manageable instrument than an individual who, did he resist, might be made to realize the uncertainty of human existence; also to decree irresponsible infallibility of such a person quashed all the controversies on the relative power of pope and of councils; in fact, did away with councils altogether. Intent to take action in this direction was first mentioned to

Digitized by Google

the congregation of rites on 6th December, 1864; the formal summons to a meeting on 8th December, 1869, was issued on 29th July, 1868. Some two and a half months afterwards a false air of œcumenicity was attempted by invitations to Greek prelates and to Protestants, so hampered by limitations and conditions that acceptance involved beforehand an acknowledgment of papal infallibility. The Jesuit College was busy inditing and distributing circulars and more private letters. The place of meeting was the Vatican, where the ultramontane element could easily be made predominant; most bishops of this hue had, during his long tenure of the chair, been appointed by Pius, and he had taken advantage in 1862 of a large gathering of bishops in Rome, witnessing the beatification of some not very exemplary Japanese missionaries, to thoroughly ascertain their pliability. Also at the time of meeting, a great many bishops "in partibus," titular ones and such as held minute or shadowy sees, were invited to, lodged and fed in the Vatican. It was, however, not enough by gerymandering votes to force through any dogma, it also was important to preclude, if possible, any adverse proposal or enunciation of an irrefutable adverse argument. Therefore ten days before the first meeting, too short a time for objections to be effectual, the bull "Multiplices Inter" was issued; it consisted of these arrangements for tyrannizing the meeting:—All officers of council to be nominated by the pope. Six committees, the members selected by the pope, to arrange for each subject the mode of procedure. Any member of council wishing to bring forward any proposition or argument, can only do so by permission of the appropriate committee, to whom it must be delivered in writing some days previously. If disallowed, it must not be broached at any general meeting. Any proposal or subject not disallowed must be discussed

Digitized by Google

previous to being propounded at a general meeting at a "preliminary congregation" of members of the departmental committees (nominees therefore of the pope). Anyone desiring to speak, can only do so by permission of the president (a papal nominee), and priority belongs to members of those committees. Differences of opinion must be referred, before discussion at any general meeting, to the committee in charge of the particular subject. No matter to be broached which the committee or pope considered contravened any tradition of the Church.*—Secrecy as to all proceedings was declared inviolable.

These gag-arrangements were even too meticulous; before the curtain rose the wires and their pullers were absurdly evident; the embroilment and denouement of the farce were too close together. All the various occurrences need not be detailed, but certain incidents are too characteristic to be passed over. Pius rejected, more or less curtly, all requests for some moderation in his claim to force upon the Church any notion he chose to dignify by the name of tradition—he meant to have infallibility, as he himself said, *senza condizione*. The majority, very largely made up of ignorant men (some from South America, Africa, etc.), were drilled into howling down expressions of adverse opinion The Prince-bishop Schwartzenberg, Strossmayer and Döllinger, who were the best informed men on the council, were thus treated. Indeed the second of these ventured to rebut some absurd charges that had just been uttered against Protestants; a violent uproar arose, and when he added "that alone can be imposed on the faithful as a dogma, which has a moral unanimity of the bishops in its favour," the fury broke all bounds. Several reverend, or what should have been

* As Pius said "La tradizione son io": this meant any matter adverse to his own opinion.

Digitized by Google

reverend bishops rushed to the tribunal, and shook their fists in the speaker's face, shouting "Damn him!" (illum damnamus).—There were fifteen cardinalates vacant, and these were a sore temptation to many; few could imitate Darboy's disinterested remark—"Not having a cold in the head I do not particularly want a hat." The Chaldean Patriarch Auda made, on the 25th January, a speech strongly deprecating innovations. The irate pope sent him a summons to his rooms for the following morning, especially ordering that he was to be alone. Pius violently abused him, calling him obstinate, mulish, and ordered him either to give up his seat at the council or his privileges and emoluments in the Church; a request for two days to consider was peremptorily refused. Had he not given way he would have been imprisoned (Quirinus). The Patriarch, seventy-eight years old, related to the Patriarch Jussuf of Antioch this occurrence, and so it became known to all the bishops—many remarking that voting or even speaking against infallibility was a dangerous matter. * The bishops began to melt insensibly away, and it was found advisable to prohibit the exodus; yet there still remained an embarrassing number of such as opposed infallibility, and the voting was to take place on the 18th. On the 12th the bishops, more especially the "non-placets," were informed that on the call of private affairs or to safeguard health they would be permitted to leave. Remembering the Patriarch Auda, this latter phrase appealed strongly to many prelates, who quitted Rome as quickly as they could. Thus were left the infallibility clique: six hundred and twenty-five, less than half the number originally assembled; of these two had the courage to vote "non placet."

As far as infallibility was concerned, the Jesuits had been successful; but they had also laid a plot design-

* Darboy called the whole assemblage a band of brigands.

Digitized by Google

ed to coincide in time with that dogma. By his influence over the devout Empress Eugenie, her director, obeying orders of the Jesuit College, prompted her to urge her suffering and reluctant husband to declare war by catholic France against heretic Prussia. This, which until it proved disastrous she was fond of calling "ma petite guerre," necessitated withdrawal of the French troops from Rome. Nine weeks after Pius had gained infallibility, Rome became the capital of the Italian kingdom; papal temporal power was at an end.

One result of this Vatican Council was to create division in the Romish Church, the old Catholics long formed a separate community; yet, though protesting, they hesitated to call themselves Protestants. The "Kultur Kampf" in Germany also led to nothing worth mentioning, and there is now an apparent unity of faith; but there are only a few of the more ignorant among the masses who have any belief in Pius' new doctrines,—neither in his infallibility, in the immaculate conception, nor in Joseph's patronage of the Church. Many people likewise are perturbed in endeavouring to forecast what they may next be called on to believe or to feign to believe.

It may be worth while trying to find out when popes first began to be infallible; it could not be when Honorius and Liberius were deposed for heresy, nor while Gothic and Lombard kings placed their nominees (chiefly Arians) on the chair, nor indeed during the 10th century when atrocious strumpets—as Baronius and Platina say—put there their paramours and bastards; nor when from two to five popes were mutually calling each other anti-Christ and "not pope". The five popes who decreed that for laymen reception of the eucharistic wine was essential and obligatory, were not considered infallible by the Council of Constance when it reversed their decrees; nor John XXIII. when it deposed him. Clement XIV. issued for aboli-

Digitized by Google

tion of the Jesuits the most stringently worded bull possible, absolutely forbidding that its meaning should ever be altered or explained away. Pius VII. did not imagine that pope infallible when, rescinding that bull, he reinstated the order (1814). It is evident, therefore, that papal infallibility began only thirty years ago with that gentleman who guaranteed a fatuous document as a genuine letter sent from Heaven by Christ, and who by his Bulla de Compositione decreed himself partner in the gains of thieves and prostitutes (p. 69).

A quotation already given may be repeated. "To name oneself Universal Bishop is to call oneself the only bishop and to encroach on the rights of all others. This haughty designation is a blasphemy and an insult to the Gospels, to the Canons of Councils, and to the decrees of the Fathers. One who assumes such title brings grave injury on the Church; he is the predecessor of anti-Christ, the embodiment of Lucifer." Ever since A.D. 607 the bishops of Rome, according to the infallible dictum of that great pope Gregory I., have acted in those two capacities.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XVI

THE PEACE POPE

The truth is not in him.

ON Febr. 7th, 1878, Mastai Ferretti died. Besides the introduction of two new dogmata, his pontificate was marked by the emission of a circular ("Quanta Cura") with an appended Syllabus of what he called "the principal errors of our time." During a large part of this period Joachim Pecci was Archbishop of Perugia, and in that capacity issued several pastorals deeply stained with the same hatred of the Gospels and of intellectual progress as is evinced in the circular and syllabus. The first of these pastorals is dated 12th Febr., 1860—two months before the appearance of the syllabus—its whole tone indicating it as one of the many feelers sent out at that period. The last coincided with the death of Pius (at the same time that of 1860 was reissued) and, whether or not designedly so, greatly contributed to Pecci's success at the Conclave; for now no cardinal has the smallest chance of the papacy unless the Jesuit College be certain that he will further its plans. Nor, when elected, dare any pope, remembering the fate of four or five predecessors, contravene its behests. The syllabus with which Pecci so cordially agreed contains nine sections, each with from three to nine items, some of which are here quoted, the numbering is as in the original. Comprehension will be the easier if the

Digitized by Google

reader will mentally prefix * to each clause—It is a grievous error to think or say: "§ 15. That every man is free to embrace and profess that religion which he, guided by the light of reason, believes to be true. § 17. That men may at least hope for the eternal salvation of those who do not live in the bosom of the true (Romish) Church. § 18. That Protestantism is but another form of the same true Christian religion; a form in which man may be as pleasing to God as in the Catholic (Romish) Church. § 20. That the ecclesiastical authority ought not to exercise its prerogative (extirpating doubters of papal divinity) without the permission and assent of the secular government. § 24. That the Church has not the right of employing force (rack and stake) and has no secular power direct or indirect. § 27. That at the present day it is no longer beneficial that in any state the Romish Catholic must be the only permissible religion to the exclusion of every other form of worship. § 78. That in some countries called Catholic the laws are wise which permit strangers visiting or residing in them, the public exercise of their own modes of worship. § 80. That the Romish Pontiff may and should recognize and agree with modern progress, liberty, and civilization.—To these crudities Pecci in his pastorals fully assented; he won the election in the Vatican after a very short conclave, became Leo XIII., and began a fresh series of enouncements, now called circulars or encyclica. Leo is much more astute than his predecessor, and well knows the worth of a conciliatory manner and of a constant mechanical smile, which have gained for him

* Pius wrote in his Syllabus that it is a grievous error to think or say "that Divine Revelation is imperfect and therefore subject to a continuous and indefinite progress." Yet he continually invented new dogmata:—the Immaculate Conception—Joseph, Patron of the Church—Papal Infallibility.

Digitized by Google

the inappropriate by-name of "Peace-pope." Of the thirty-seven circulars we have carefully examined, several deal with that plagiarism on the Buddhist knick-knack, the rosary, calling it a "divine wreath woven from the salutations of angels" and with praises of Dominic, of whom he says that "he fought for the Catholic (Romish) Church not by arms, not by force, but trusting implicitly in prayers on the rosary"—an expression peculiarly inapplicable to him who introduced the Inquisition. Leo, like Pius, also desires to substitute for worship of God, that of Mary, whom he calls "Queen of the Christian's Heaven,—the Powerful Victor in Wars" etc., etc. Her apocryphal mother, Anna, is placed among the proper objects of worship, and her husband Joseph is promoted to be, instead of Jesus, "Patron of the Church.*

A line or two ago the name Peace-pope was called inappropriate—it is so because Leo's wrîtten utterances consist in the main of the fiercest attacks on Protestants and on all the results of the Reformation. But that the unfitness of these onslaughts may be the better assessed, a view of the sort of thing which Huss, Luther and others desired to amend may be given; it cannot be ascribed to protestant calumny since this phrase was written by Bellarmine, a cardinal of the Romish Church, which he thus described:—"For many years previous to the rise of the Lutheran and Calvinist heresy, there was in ecclesiastic matters no discipline, no regulation of morals, no knowledge of Holy Writ, no reverence for divine things, almost entire absence of religion." Against the men whose reverent godliness was revolted at this condition to which popedom in fifteen centuries had led Christianity, Leo flings much vituperation, some of which may be now quoted—thus, he calls their zeal for self-

* Circulars of 7th Sept. 1883—30th Aug. 1884—22nd Sept. 1891—8th Sept. 1892—8th Sept. 1893.

Digitized by Google

sacrifice, purity and rightly directed worship "a pest", "a stupid fickle system"... "The war carried on against God," "deriding the Word of God." The Protestants, he says, busy themselves in enlarging the "rule of Satan." "The hatred of the impious for the temporal power is caused by their perception that it is a great support to religion, which they have sworn to destroy"... "It is easy to lapse, as the followers of this teaching do, into praise of all that is evil, into deifying sensual pleasure and into insulting the laws of decency and pudicity" (Let the life history of most popes, bishops and priests, from A.D. 500 to 1600 be remembered.) "while pretexting a search for beauty."... "Behold the fruit of that immense rebellion which arose in the world." "When the solicitude which we feel for your souls leads us to seek the origin of this, we can only find it in that satanic cunning which they employ to destroy souls."... "He ceases to be a Catholic, who denies that the Romish Pontiff is the father and owner of every Christian." *

The very frequent censures by popes and by the committee for amending the Church, (p. 61 *et seq.)* on the "lubricitas" and "impudicitia" of bishops and clergy, the yearly permissive tax for priests to live in concubinage, the immorality of nuns and conversion of nunneries into places of ill-resort for monks and clerics—clearly show whence Leo took this description. It is, however, characteristic of his methods, that he applied it, not to those who amply merited the rebuke, but to those whose moral sense was revolted by the continual and permitted practices of nearly every Romish priest of whatever grade. Indeed it was these abominations, perpetrated in and permitted by the Romish Church, which chiefly brought about the absolutely necessary reformation, without which that institution

* Pastorals of Febr. 1860—77—78.

Digitized by Google

would have sunk smothered in its mire (p. 63). Yet Leo vituperates in unmeasured terms all Protestants; they decline to supply him with subsidies or to acknowledge him as their god. These words may seem to some an unwarrantable attack, but belligerence may not be all on one side; those who dissent from Romish methods are called fiends, (Card. Perron) men given over to every evil, enlarging the rule of the Prince of Darkness; while every Romish bishop now is obliged on installation to swear: "I will by all means in my power combat and attack all heretics, schismatics and all who disobey our Lord God the Pope! (Dominus noster Deus papa.)

In the subject of mixed marriages Leo is more peremptory and tyrannical than any of his predecessors; also he goes out of his way to insult those who have married by other than the Romish rite, (which they call a sacrament) naming their rightful cohabitation concubinage.

His invective against Freemasonry is absurdly farcical (20th April, 1884). "The human race is divided into two parts: one all for good" (himself and accomplices), "the other all for evil" (masons). In another (20th June, 1894), he calls "the masonic sect a formidable power which has long oppressed nations.... from the dark retreats in which it lays its plots and snares it comes forth into the broad light of our cities as though to hurl defiance at God.... both the perversity of its opinions and the iniquity of its designs are known to all the world.... under colour of vindicating human rights and reforming society, it inimically attacks the very name of Christian.... Even now they no longer conceal their plans, but audaciously encourage each other against God... too well known is it to require proof that they strive to overturn the constitution of states and to aid the many audacious men who hope to abolish

Digitized by Google

all ranks and rights and to declare communism together with equality of fortune and position," and so on through many paragraphs of senile scolding. Were he a freemason, the writer would be debarred (so at least he believes) from writing a word in defence of that Society—indeed it is not necessary, for people in all ranks of life know of the schools and other charitable institutions it supports. The idea that emperors, kings, their wealthiest and most cultured subjects should be the highest officials of a society aiming at the overthrow of states and the destruction of property is ridiculous.

In 1888 the pope expended a good deal of print on the subject of "Liberty, most excellent gift of nature.... No one has proclaimed freedom more loudly than the Romish Church," which dictum is very incongruous with the doings of the Inquisition, with the six thousand religio-political prisoners of Gregory XVI., with the many incarcerations and executions, after his re-entry into Rome, of Pius IX. Indeed, after reading quotations from Leo's circulars, given at the end of this chapter, the reader will probably be hardly able to imagine what precise idea he attaches to the word "liberty."

On 5th May, 1888, Leo addressed a letter (De manumissione servorum) ostensibly to the Bishop of Brazil, but evidently intended for European consumption. It boasts of liberation of slaves as the work exclusively of the Romish Church. "He who compares the treatment of slaves by the heathens and by the Christians, must willingly acknowledge that the former was harsh and cruel, the latter mild and full of kindness, nor will he venture to refuse to the Church the praise she has well deserved for the wisdom she displayed in eradicating this hideous plague spot." We will now look at the truth. From the first few years of the Roman Empire onward, and even somewhat earlier,

Digitized by Google

the severity, owing to the constant fear of revolt, with which slaves had been treated, was much relaxed, as evidenced by the writings, though they did not originate the change, of Seneca and Epictetus. In the times of Hadrian and the Antonines the treatment of slaves was benevolent, even kindly. The power of life and death, withdrawn from the owner, was confined to the magistrates; the "lex Petronia" forbade the use of slaves for wild-beast combats; they were allowed to marry—wife, husband, children could not be separated by sale; the slave had a legal status, could appeal, and was protected against harshness or underfeeding. Manumission was so common that enactments to diminish its frequency were necessary. These reforms began before the Christian era, their culmination under Marcus Aurelius was due to Stoic philosophy. The date of these emperors coincides with the slow genesis of Christianity in Rome; its teachings, however, did not influence those princes, who opposed and disliked the religion. Moreover, the Church in Rome at that time consisted almost exclusively of slaves; it could not, as Leo avers, take the whole class under its protection and guard it from the masters' cruelty; it was, indeed, not even able to protect itself. As soon as the Romish Church after 325 was dominant, the condition of slaves became greatly worse. Canon law is filled with enactments on the utter subjection of the "vile race" (vile genus), as the haughty clerics now called their slaves; they became simply property. In regard to their marriage, the choice of spouse was never conceded, since "under no circumstances can free will (liberum arbitrium) be permitted to a slave".... "No one shall dare appropriate or estrange the immobilia of the Church, neither chattels, coloni, nor field-slaves (rusticum mancipium)."... "Every one knows that what is brought is an offering to God, be it a man (or woman), an animal, an estate,

Digitized by Google

or any thing else, etc." "Bishops, as they are also in trust of Church property, must not sell things or slaves belonging to the Church." (Leo extols this as a boon to slaves.) The value of a living was estimated by the number of human beings it possessed—"A church with not less than ten slaves must be served by a priest, a church with less than ten," etc. When, as a rarity, manumission took place, clerics did not, like laymen, altogether loosen their grip—"Liberated slaves, having left the clientage of the church formerly owning them, shall be again reduced to slavery if they do not return when called upon."

Another sentence from Leo's letter runs thus: "The Romish Church constantly considered and lost no opportunity of studying how their entire freedom, which also would conduce to their eternal benefit, might be obtained." The decrees and regulations above quoted witness but badly to this alleged pre-occupation,—indeed they rather show the most grim determination not to lose the value of a penny in human bodies. Therefore the Romish Church took sundry means of augmenting this sort of possession. Most clerics bought licenses to keep as many concubines as they could maintain, and there were plenty of opportunities in the confessional. The bastards of clerics were "slaves of that church to the priest of which they owe their shameful existence." (Conc. Toled. Decr. II. Can. XV. and the decree of Benedict VIII.) Thus nearly every priest augmented from his own loins Church wealth in human flesh. By the 13th century the Church had acquired in Europe about one-third of the land; rightful interest on loans was forbidden by canon law, which, however, was disregarded by prelates and abbots; therefore, if a bad year came to some of the few remaining freeholders, they had no other resource but in one of these persons. Once in such debt his freedom was gone,

Digitized by Google

he was bound to the soil, a helpless prey, for no debtor (unless a great noble) was allowed to leave the locality. When a state, by declining to yield something that he coveted, angered a pope he interdicted it, and, if greatly enraged, decreed its inhabitants to be the slaves of any who chose to capture them; so did Boniface VIII. to the clan of the Colonnas, Clement V. to the Venetians, Gregory XI. to the Florentines, as also did Sixtus IV., angry at failing in his attempt to murder Lorenzo il Magnifico. All English people were by Paul IV. declared to be slaves.

By very old custom such slaves as could escape to the capitol and promised, if not already so, to become Christians, might petition and sometimes obtain liberty. Evasion, however, was difficult as they were chained at night; did one succeed in breaking his fetters, passage through the streets was perilous, for it was the usage to brand the vile genus with a hot iron on face or forehead, to fasten large brass rings to their perforated ears, iron ones to their neck and feet; they wore, too, a very distinctive garb. In 1537, in spite of these hindrances, the number of evasions caused the Roman citizens to complain to Paul III., he whom Leo describes as so anxious to eradicate slavery, abrogated the ancient custom, barring thus to the unhappy ones even this slender chance of freedom. In the 15th, 16th and 17th centuries popes, generally in partnership with Genoese or Venetians, sent out galleys to prey on Mediterranean (chiefly on Turkish) trade, and secured as a rule the lion's share of prey in human flesh. "The pope is arming two of the galleys which, in the division of the spoil, have fallen to his share, and will man them with the slaves that in the same way have been allotted to him." Urban VIII. (1625—44) was very ardent in this pursuit; his successor, Innocent X., bought and sold human livestock very freely; but the sharpest of all clerical

Digitized by Google

slave-dealers was Alexander VII. (1655—67). Giovanni Bao, an oar-slave on a captured Turkish galley, was immediately, though an Italian Christian, transferred to a papal one; this was very common, as it was scarcely ever possible that people enslaved by Turks could keep their baptismal certificates. His frequent petitions for release were ignored, and he was worked for thirteen years at the oar. Old and broken down, he at the end of that time was able to make a tempting offer to the pope, who thus signified acceptance to his galley-master. "As he (Bao) wishes to be liberated, he has humbly begged for this mercy, in return for which he has undertaken to supply to our galleys two Turkish slaves, young, in good health and fit for work, and as we are minded to extend to him our beneficence (!!) we direct you to free him, when he has furnished to our captain of the galley two young robust and healthy slaves." An identical bargain was made with one "Mustapha the lame". Thus in these two cases, and there are records of several rather less successful bargains, Alexander VII. obtained by his "clemency and beneficence" four young valuable slaves for two worn-out and decrepit ones. The date of the letters are respectively 5th January, 1658, and 24th March, 1659. More than two centuries later than the time which Leo fixes as that when the "people had nearly expunged this blot of slavery." If the people had effected this, popes were doing their very best to perpetuate it. * The last verifiable instance of a papal slave-traffic bears date early in the 19th century.

The above mention by Leo of a date occurs in the following paragraphs of his slave-letter: "When, towards the end of the 15th century, Christian peoples had nearly expunged this blot of slavery ... the

* See "Bertolotti Rassegna Settimanale," 1879, and "Die Kirche und Sklaverei," Brecht.

Digitized by Google

Church watched with vigilant forethought the newly discovered regions of Africa, Asia and America, for the rumour had spread that the leaders of those expeditions used their superiority in arms to impose slavery on the inoffensive people. Nevertheless the sad state of things continued, and Paul III. took an extreme measure before the world by proclaiming that to all these people a threefold form of liberty belongs; at the same time he wrote to the Archbishop of Toledo, threatening with ban and interdict all who should contravene this decree."

The rumour to which the pope refers was correct; but Leo carefully avoids saying that this enslavement was set afoot—not merely suggested or connived at, but actually ordered and decreed—by popes. Nicholas IV. in 1452 wrote to Alfonso, King of Portugal: "We give to you, in the fulness of our apostolic powers, free and limitless permission to attack and subdue Saracens, infidels and enemies of Christ, to seize their principalities, territories and possessions and to reduce them to perpetual slavery." On 10th Jan., 1454, referring more particularly to Hindustan and the far East, he reiterated this in harder words and more mandatory form. Alfonso's troops were ordered to rob these people "wherever they may be found, of everything they possess, which we have in a former document given to you as prey, that you may fall upon them, attack, assault, subdue, conquer and reduce them to eternal slavery." Thus were many of these peoples brought to Portugal and sold as merchandize. The powers thus conferred by bull were confirmed and renewed by Calixtus III. (1455—58) and by Sixtus IV. (1471—84). When America was discovered, Alexander VI. conferred on the King of Spain the right "to overthrow (deprimere) and subject (subjicere) all the inhabitants of those lands." The conquerors accordingly had killed directly and worked to death so large a

Digitized by Google

percentage* of the natives that labour was scarce. The capture, deportation and enslavement of African negroes was started in perfect accord with the bull of Nicholas IV., and managed chiefly by papal emissaries, missionary and other. This, according to Leo, is "the vigilant forethought of the Church," but he forgot to explain that the forethought was directed solely to its money-bags.

Very remarkable conduct is ascribed in this slave-letter to Paul III.—namely, that while he was riveting still more firmly and grimly the chains of slavery in Rome, he should adopt extreme measures by writing to the Archbishop of Brazil, proclaiming freedom there; so strange would such action be that we have carefully studied this document, which is dated Kalend. Junii, 1537,—it is the only letter Paul wrote to that prelate, an authentic copy in old black letter lies before us. It grants baptism to those who wished or were forced to accept it, it contains certain regulations as to eating, or abstaining from milk puddings and like trivialities. Its really stringent directions concern the opening up of new plantations to be possessed by Paul, and of course only workable by slaves, also certain days are specified when those unhappy ones might rest from their slave-work (a servilibus operibus). Of freedom it says not one word. However, no one acquainted with Leo's mental powers would pay his intelligence so poor a compliment as to imagine that he himself believes a single sentence of his slave-letter. Characteristic, too, is the omission of such names as Woolmans, Clarkson, Penn, Wilberforce and of many others. Already in the latter half of the 17th century, speakers in protestant England

* Fourteen years after his discovery Columbus computed that six-sevenths of the population had thus perished. Of the above gentlemen Leo says: "The popes, my predecessors, with ever heaven-directed gaze, used unceasing efforts to eradicate this stain of slavery."

Digitized by Google

and America were agitating against slavery; heretic Denmark was working in the same direction. In 1792 a bill in parliament decreed that slavery should cease in all British dominions; this was very nearly a half century before a pope discovered that it is unchristian to hold slaves (Gregory XIV. in 1839), applying therefore this adjective to all his predecessors. Neither did the papacy, as Leo states, take the slightest trouble, nor incur the smallest expense in suppressing the transatlantic shipment of negroes, while England was spending lavishly of her money and not sparingly of her blood in cleansing the seas of that stain. Cardinal Manning endeavoured to palliate this sort of fiction contained in the pope's letters, by saying that "dogma is above history," a singular utterance since no man, though he may have won an election in Rome, can undo or alter, but evidently can misrepresent, what has already occurred.

This pope in '90 and '91 shed a good deal of commiseration on "the condition of labour" and directed Cardinal Manning to take an active part in obtaining for certain workmen on strike satisfaction of their demands; it was an astute attempt to capture their sympathy and—in case he could, like so many of his predecessors, stir up strife—gain their co-operation. That Leo's expressions of sympathy were of this crocodile character is evidenced by his circular, enjoining that in all Romish Catholic schools the text-books for teaching should be those of Thomas Aquinas (Cir. Æterni Patris, 4 August, '78). This is what that "Angelic doctor" says about tradesmen, workmen and labourers. Teaching that princes and barons etc. mays afely tyrannize over those less highly placed, if they in their turn will bow down to the pope—he goes on thus: "the members of a properly constituted state must secure their own welfare... but those who live by trade, agriculture or field labour, have

Digitized by Google

no desert (virtus); their lowly lives are not founded on excellence, therefore they are not members of and have no part in or claim on the state.... Thus it is necessary for the state that the people should be in servitude.... It is thus of advantage to the state that farmers, artizans and those who labour for wage should be slaves and absolutely no part of the state.... Warriors, counsellors and priests form the state, these citizens must take care to maintain the ownership of their servitors, and it is right to make war on those who rebel.... It is advantageous to the state that those who cultivate the soil should be slaves strong in body, of weak intellect, of little courage and of a different flesh, for thus they will be more serviceable to labour and less likely to conspire against their owners." Yet the infallible pope who decrees that this shall be taught in Romish schools, writes a letter, and to the prelates of Brazil a circular, about what he considers liberty. Space does not permit of lengthy quotations from more encyclical incongruities, those already given afford the light in which all Leo's verbiage must be regarded. Below are put together excerpta from other circulars, and one or two from the syllabus. "To the followers of Lucifer belong the adherents of that wide-spread and powerful party which, deriving their name from freedom, call themselves Liberals." He is greatly shocked that "the bonds which unite the citizens of any state should not come from one placed over and above them, but should be founded on the consent of the citizens themselves... in consequence of which, power is derived from the people, the majority deciding what is to be its limitations and its duty"... "Freedom of belief is extremely injurious, both to the rulers and the ruled. Hence it is not permissible to demand, justify or grant freedom of thought, speech, writing, teaching, nor choice of religion as though these liberties

Digitized by Google

were gifts of nature. . . ." "Contrary to the Scriptures, the doctrine of the Church and of the Holy Fathers, people do not hesitate to affirm that the best government is that which does not recognize the duty of punishing those who dissent from the Catholic (Romish) Church. In consequence of this absolutely false idea of civil government, they scruple not to support that erroneous opinion so fatal to the Romish Church and the safety of souls (?), which our predecessor Gregory XVI. called an insanity: that liberty of conscience is the right of every man." "He ceases to be a Christian, who denies that the pope is the master and owner of every man." "It is a great error to think (Syll. 24) that the Church has not the right of using force or that it has no temporal power direct or indirect." "It is a great error to think (*ib.* 31) that ecclesiastical jurisdiction for temporal causes, whether civil or criminal, of the clergy, ought to be absolutely abolished without even consulting the Holy See or taking heed of its protests." * "It is great error to think (*ib.* 37) that national Churches can be established independent of the authority of the Romish Pontiff and entirely separated from him."

Thus Pius IX. and Leo XIII., though the latter begins a circular with "Liberty, most excellent gift of nature," so circumscribed it that no man, according to them, may think his own thoughts, choose his religion, say his own words, or do anything worth doing, without the consent of a successful canvasser in Italy. It is undesirable to insult the reader's intelligence by pointing out the ghastly effect upon the world could its governance be forced back 1000 years; fortunately neither Pius nor Leo possessed the power, though they had all the will and ambition of an

* This aims at restoring that "benefit of clergy" which was in most countries, and certainly in England, a great curse and a potent cause of priestly crime.

Digitized by Google

Innocent III. or Boniface VIII., as is shewn by the quotations just given. Nevertheless, a few words must be said about a circular addressed to the clergy and people of France (16th Febr., 1892): "We must now refer to a very astute calumny invented in order to support odious imputations against catholics and against the holy chair itself. It has been asserted that the energy and activity enjoined on catholics (this word means ultramontanes) for the defence of their religion have for hidden aim, not so much protection of religious interests as capture for the Church (papacy) political domination over states; that indeed is an attempt to revive a very ancient calumny." Then follow some allusions too blasphemous to translate. But it may be noticed that in jesuit diction the word calumny nearly always means a perfectly well-proven fact which is distasteful or injurious to that party. Neither can it be supposed that Leo was ignorant of the political aggressions of Gregory VII., Innocent III. and of many others, nor indeed of the frequent inhibitions and excommunications inflicted for merely predatory purposes. Even if so flimsy an excuse for perversion of fact be admitted; yet that which he calls calumny is entirely applicable to his own and to Pius IX.'s writings and aspirations.

The "Osservatore Romano" is a newspaper in papal pay, hence the views it expresses, since the sheet is especially for Italian consumption, are much more likely to embody Leo's real ideas than are the effusions he thinks wise to send abroad; those views are as follow: "Politics are neither more nor less than morals applied to the social acts of governments and to the public life of peoples. Now the pope is admittedly the infallible teacher of faith and morals; it follows therefore that he is the unerring judge in both spheres (religion and morals) inasmuch as the practical application of morals by individuals and

Digitized by Google

nations must not be allowed to run counter to the commands interests and rights of the faith (Romish). It is clear, therefore, that as the pope is an infallible teacher in all that concerns what we must believe in the religious sphere and what we should do in the domains of morals, he is in like manner the faultless judge of what we should do or not do in public as in private life." He had already reduced these theories of his newspaper to practice, for in the circular "Jampridem" (1886), he directed Romish priests in Germany to strenuously oppose enactment of any laws limiting his infallibility; this was six years before he misrepresented well-attested records of papal aggression to be calumny. Again, fourteen years after that hardy declaration, that is in January 1902, he caused his legate in Vienna to seek an interview with the emperor and to request him to inflict severe punishments on his non-Romish subjects. The monarch graciously replied, that liberty of conscience is guaranteed by the constitution of his empire, that he could not change the fundamental laws of his dominions nor would he contravene them. Thus Leo, though in words repudiating that popes had in the past, do in the present, or would ever in the future desire to interfere in political matters, was doing that very thing by requiring a monarch to abrogate or infringe the laws on which his throne rests, so that he (Leo) might have the pleasure of imprisoning or killing Protestants. *

* No fitting place has been found in the text for another example of Leo's hardihood of assertion. He states, cir. 1878, that the Romish Church favored and assisted Copernicus, Kepler, Gallileo and many other scientists. The three are especially named, because the last was persecuted by the Inquisition in Rome, and because Copernicus' works and any books teaching that the earth rotates on its own axis and revolves round the sun, were forbidden and on the Index till 1835.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XVII

PAPO—CÆSARISM

Give to every man, that asketh a reason for the hope, that is in you

THE hatred which Leo harbours against all who will not bow down to him as infallible god is more fully and frequently expressed than could be exemplified by adding further quotations in the preceding chapter. Both he and Pius desire permission to use force (which only can mean re-establishment of the Inquisition) in order to compel belief in papal almight and infallibility. They both try to prevent any other cult than the Romish, and where they have the power they succeed in the prohibition. In the meanwhile, in lands largely protestant they complain of persecution, because papistry is not accorded preferential treatment. It is, however, very difficult or impossible to see what those religionists, at all events in England since 1829, can possibly lament about; unless it be that they may not oppress other believers. In Great Britain the conduct of papists from 1534 to the end of the 18th century had been such as to create justifiable suspicion and dread of popish plots. During the first half of the 19th century popes had quite enough to do in steering a course among sundry quicksands, and had ceased from marked aggressiveness. The Irish and English Romanists, supported by the tolerant feelings of many in the realm, called loudly for abrogation of "Catholic disabilities."

Digitized by Google

In 1824 and '25, before both houses of Parliament, evidence was taken as to whether the obedience those persons owed to the pope, interfered with their allegiance to the monarch and the state. As witnesses Bishop Doyle and the vicars-apostolic, Archbishop Murray at their head, were examined; their answers were thus: "Catholics are not obliged to obey the pope save in matters of religious belief and discipline" (Doyle). The others made a "collective declaration": "Neither the pope nor any other prelate or ecclesiastical person has any right to interfere directly or indirectly in civil governments, or to oppose in any manner, the performance of civil duties due to the king." They also declared on oath "that it is not an article of the Catholic faith, neither are catholics bound to believe, that popes are infallible." Parliament, re-assured by these sworn assertions, passed the "Act for the relief of His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects"; yet, bound by former experience to be cautious, it exacted from all of that religion who had been elected to parliament, who as peers could claim a seat in the upper house, or from such as had been appointed to any civic office, an oath of allegiance to the reigning monarch and repudiation of any belief that excommunication by the See of Rome entailed deposition or justified regicide; and further to swear "I do declare that I do not believe that the Pope of Rome nor any other foreign prince, prelate, person, state or potentate hath or ought to have any Power, Superiority, or Pre-eminence directly or indirectly within this realm.... And I do solemnly swear that I never will exercise any privilege to which I am or may become entitled, to disturb or weaken the Protestant Religion or the Protestant Government in the United Kingdom." Twenty-five years after this generous act was passed, the popes of Rome began a series of aggressions, firstly by the Syllabus and the

Digitized by Google

bull "Quanta Cura," then by the appointment of a number of archbishops and bishops to different places in England, a denial, as the then Bishop of London called it, of the headship in our Church of the monarch —these men called archbishop or bishop of this or the other place, are not bishops there at all, the sovereign of England, as being also head of the English Church, alone has power to confer the title of an English see. It is somewhat strange that people should condescend to address those pretenders by such fictitious appellations. Bishop Blomfield also said that this Act was virtually a denial of the position of the English clergy; he did not survive to see this negation put down in black and white by the Romish bishop, but the country had not long to wait for the additional outrage. On 13th September, 1896, Leo issued a circular concerning the validity of English orders, a subject with which he has as little to do as the Dalai Lama or the Sultan of Morocco with his own. The act was an utterly unwarrantable piece of meddlesome impertinence directed against the Queen, the prelates, the clergy and people of the realm. Recognizing how it was hoodwinked seventy years ago, and how every concession to Romish interference is used as an escarpment, from behind which to direct further assaults, parliament may be forced greatly to modify the Emancipation Act, or at least to insist on observance of the oath above quoted.

The Edwardine ordinations are perfectly valid and correct, as abundantly proved by the Archbishop of Canterbury (Benson) and others. Such is far from being the case with the status of the pope. The antichristian title of Universal Bishop (p. 75) with the alleged prerogatives fabled to belong to such office was by Boniface III. purchased of the ruthless usurper Phocas (608), the price being recognition of his sovereignty and approval or at least condonation of very

Digitized by Google

horrible murders. Transmission of the keys * to the Romish bishops from Peter—indeed his presence in Rome—is an untenable figment. The boasted unbroken chain of succession from that apostle to the present day, even if its first link, as forged by Rome, were otherwise than rotten, has again and again been broken by flagrant vice in the bishop's chair. On these two bootless assertions of transmission do the Romish bishops build their claims. How they have suborned rioters, bribed electors and murdered predecessors to get into the chair has already been studied, as also how they have trafficked and huckstered with their alleged possession, the keys—that is to say, have used and abused what they vouched for as the keys of Heaven, for the mere acquisition of earthly wealth and power. These objects were repudiated by Christ Himself. To one requesting Him to bid his brother share the inheritance, He replied: "Man! who has made me a judge or divider among you?" † To Pilate He answered: "My Kingdom is not of this world." § He instructed the disciples that "they who are accounted to rule over the Gentiles lord it over them and exercise authority over them. But so it shall not be among you." †† Those who call themselves His vice-gerents have done and still claim to do those very things which among His disciples He would not tolerate; they claim that their kingdom is "of this world," "to lord it over and exercise authority over them" among whom He said "such shall not be." For very long they held all the kingdoms of the world the power and the glory of them. These were offered to the Jesus by Satan as a temptation §§ and refused; His self-styled vice-gerents have greedily snatched at the

* Here it may be pointed out that what was given were "the keys of Heaven," they had therefore nothing to do with earthly possessions.

† Luke XII. 14. § John XVIII. 36.

†† Mark. X. 42—3. §§ Luke IV. 9.

Digitized by Google

bribe; their conduct has alienated much of this glory and power; but they still long to reëstablish papo-imperialism, the intriguing and striving for which is called ultramontanism. Its aim and object is to subject all men, their every thought and aspiration to the pope—or rather, since he is but their tool and mouthpiece, to the Jesuits; therefore these are the chief abettors of the conspiracy against humanity. Their methods, as might be inferred from casuistic and other writings, are crafty. Under some circumstances and in certain places they deprecate references to mediæval history and bulls, as being obsolete; under different conditions they appeal to and found on them claims for the pope of universal domination. * In the Middle Ages many popes asserted the possession of every person and of everything on earth, so did Gregory VII., Innocent III., the godless Boniface and others. For instance, "The pope owns and rules every person and everything in the Universe." (Gregory IX.) These dicta survive and have been used throughout the 19th century. Pius VII. wrote: "The Church has decreed as punishment of a heretic confiscation of his property." He also enunciates as canon law, that "heretic monarchs are to be deprived of their principalities and their subjects must be ordered to break their oath of allegiance." Later, "Among errors of the present day none is more mischievous than to deny to papal authority the right to depose monarchs and to release subjects from their allegiance." † Similar claims are made by Leo XIII., which, as they and that pope's ferocious intolerance have been sufficiently described in the preceding chapter, need not now detain us; yet it seems more than doubtful whether here in England those who are hoping for Reunion with the Romish Church can know that that Church claims dominion over their monarch,

* Constantly thus used is the bull Unam Sanctam of Boniface VIII.
† Allocution to the Literary Society of Rome 20 July, 1871.

Digitized by Google

over the governance and laws or their country, even over their property and possessions. The English nation when it fully knows what papal or rather jesuit claims are, will probably not wish to become the slaves of a bishop and would-be monarch in Italy. Especially will that nation be so disinclined when it learns the nature of the claim, founded as it is on a long series of fraud and forgery (p. 75 and seq.) upheld by massacre and bloodshed. Neither will any man with a true sense of what religion is, surrender his earnest desire of communion with his God when he has studied the sort of Church he, while still unknowing, may be moved to join—a Church which claims especial heritage of the Holy Ghost. Let him, thus moved, test the validity of that claim, learn the life-history of most popes; of the murderers, the whoremongers and worse abominators that ruled the Romish Church for a hundred and fifty-eight years (896—1054); also of the vengeful and godless Boniface VIII. and Benedict IX., of the utterly depraved John XXIII., of the cynically vicious Pius II., of the murderers Sixtus IV., Alexander VI. and of very many more; then, having thus considered, he may judge whether the Holy Spirit would or could besmirch Its Pure Wings by fellowship with such workers of iniquity. Before concluding in the affirmative, it might probably be well for him to ponder these words: "Whoever blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin."

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Opinions of the Press.

"Tersely, vigorously and brightly written, without exaggeration or distortion of facts, the work is a most convincing indictment of the whole system, bringing out well its underlying paganism and anti-christian character. . . . We cordially recommend this book, which will not offend any by needless violence."—*Rock.*

"The work cannot but prove instructive and stimulating reading to many in England where the historical and doctrinal matters it discusses touch living interests so nearly."—*Scotsman.*

"It practically covers the history of the Romish Church from its foundation to the present day, very condensed of course, but so classified that the enormities formerly practised, and still, it is alleged, continued, may be easily apprehended."—*Dundee Advertiser.*

"Do any readers wish for a really excellent and full yet very compact manual on the history and character of the Roman Church? If so we emphatically commend this remarkably complete and well written summary. The volume should have a place on every student's shelf."—*Christian Commonwealth.*

"A great deal of useful information is given in a popular form, the book being small and compact and treating the subject not so much from the standpoint of scientific theology as of practical every-day considerations."—*Church Intelligence.*

"An ably written book, based entirely upon facts that are well attested."—*Park Chapel Magazine.*

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE STAMPED BELOW

AN INITIAL FINE OF 25 CENTS

WILL BE ASSESSED FOR FAILURE TO RETURN THIS BOOK ON THE DATE DUE. THE PENALTY WILL INCREASE TO 50 CENTS ON THE FOURTH DAY AND TO $1.00 ON THE SEVENTH DAY OVERDUE.

NOV 17 1940M

MAR 13 1947

15May'52VW

MAY 7 1953 LU

17FebSSMD

MAY 7 1955 LU

26May'60ES

REC'D LD

MAY 12 1960

14Dec'61LU

REC'D LD

NOV 30 1967

LD 21-100m-7,'39(6)

Digitized by Google

YB 30077

130821

BX
1765
W57

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google